

the long tradition from antiquity to the present of women's philanthropy (which the author surveys from the *Odyssey* to the contemporary work of the Philoptochos societies in the Orthodox Church). The same is done for the long history of concern for the elderly from antiquity to the present. Even the relevance of the Greek language for the Greek Orthodox Church is reviewed and realistically assessed.

The essay at the end of the book on the Fathers show that these Church leaders knew and respected Greek learning in terms consistent with Christianity, stressing the importance of *arete*, Holy Scriptures, and faithfulness to the Church's teachings, with the ultimate goal being *theosis*. The Fathers stressed the importance of moral and social justice, the implementation of the Gospel's injunction of love toward God and one another, and that true theology is the implementation of Christian love. Even monasticism and its mystics could not escape the moral obligation for the spiritual and physical care and improvement of human society, in a manner consistent with Biblical, Patristic, and Byzantine traditions and practices.

*Byzantine Heritage* is a book written with Father Constantelos' usual enthusiasm, verve, and absolute clarity. The author has admirable command of primary and secondary sources (each essay is appropriately documented) but, more than that, he sees history and religion as living forces that are vitally present in our own world today and finds the Byzantine Christian experience one that is alive, illuminating, instructive, and conducive to the promotion of a truly Christian life in today's world.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (330-1990): "First Among Equals" in the Eastern Orthodox Church.* By Deno J. Geanakoplos. Second Revised Edition. Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1990. Pp. 28 plus 4 plates. Paper. \$2.95.

Deno J. Geanakoplos, Bradford Durfee Professor Emeritus of Byzantine, Italian Renaissance History and Orthodox Church History of Yale University, is an internationally known scholar who has published thirteen books and more than one hundred articles. *A Short History*

of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, sponsored by Bishop Methodios of Boston in commemoration of the historic pastoral visit of His All-Holiness Patriarch Demetrios I during the summer of 1990 to the United States, is the first attempt to write a brief and concise account of the complex history of the Church of Constantinople from its founding to the present day. It originally substantially appeared in the lavish publication entitled *Archons of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople*, published by the Order of St. Andrew the Apostle (New York 1983) on pp. 11-27. Its convenient separate issuance with some additions makes it now available to a vastly larger audience in an attractive paperback format.

Dr. Geanakoplos rightly notes that "the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople is the most striking manifestation of the continued viability, over 1500 years, of the most creative of Byzantine institutions, the Eastern Orthodox Church," a church headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople that spread Christianity to the Slavic peoples of Eastern Europe, to certain peoples of Western Asia and North Africa, and especially "fashioned the unique religious ethos which permeated all aspects of Byzantine civilization" (p. 1). The Church of Constantinople had an Apostolic foundation, calling as its founder the Apostle Andrew, brother of Peter who is known as "the first-called" Apostle of Christ. Constantinople assumed a position equal to Rome, the original capital of the Roman Empire when Byzantium, renamed Constantinople, became the Imperial capital, in 330 A. D., an event that marked the beginning of the "Byzantine Empire."

Professor Geanakoplos outlines the history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by dividing its history into five distinct periods: (1) the phase extending from 330 A. D. to the termination of the Iconoclastic controversy, ending in the so-called "Triumph of Orthodoxy" in 843; (2) the phase beginning in 843 and ending with the fall of Constantinople to the Latins in the Fourth Crusade of 1204, followed by a Latin occupation of fifty-seven years; (3) the phase from 1261, when Constantinople was recovered from its Latin conquerors by the Byzantine Emperor Michael Palaiologos to the final fall of the imperial capital to the Ottoman Turks in 1453; (4) the so-called *Tourkokratia*, from 1453 until the Greek declaration of independence in 1821 or more specifically in 1833, when the Church of Greece declared itself an autocephalic church, independent of Constantinople; and (5) the modern period from 1833 to the present day. Its history ranges from the Golden Age of the Church Fathers (St. Gregory the Theologian

of Nazianzos, St. Basil, and St. John Chrysostom) and the Seven Ecumenical Synods (325, 381, 431, 451, 553, 680, 787), the Iconoclastic struggle (726-843), the greatest of all patriarchs Photios (857-867, 878-886), the so-called "Schism of 1054" (Michael Keroularios patriarch), the attempts at Reunion (Lyon 1274, Florence 1439), the Patriarchates of Jeremiah II of the 16th century, to the greatest Orthodox Patriarch of modern times, Athenagoras, whose attempts at reconciliation and ecumenical relations with other Christian churches are now legendary.

Deno Geanakoplos shows what the Ecumenical Patriarchate has contributed over two millenia and how it has "managed, as it must, to carry on its mission of leadership over the Orthodox Churches of the world, including the Orthodox Church of America which is directly under patriarchal jurisdiction" with all of the world's Orthodox regarding it as "the first among equals" (pp. 26-27).

*A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (330-1990)* is an indispensable guide for all Orthodox Christians and for all those who wish to understand the Orthodox Church in proper historical perspective.

*John Rexine*  
Colgate University

*Ἡ Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἀντιπαράθεσις Ἑλλήνων καὶ Λατίνων . . . 858-1439* [The Ecclesiastical Diversification of the Greeks and the Latins . . . 858-1439]. By Methodios G. Fouyas. Athens, 1990. Pp. 501. Paper.

This major volume should be of interest to scholars, historians, and theologians alike interested in the relations between the mediaeval Greek East and the Latin West. In addition to its intrinsic value as a scholarly historical and theological study of various stages in the relations between the two halves of mediaeval Christendom, it should appeal to modern ecumenists engaged in theological dialogues and inter-faith relations.

Furthermore the present book is more than a theological analysis and historical account of events that took place between the ninth and the fifteenth century of our era; it is an anatomy of the psyche of two related but also different people, who shared a common faith

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.



---

## Against Those Who Practice Usury by Gregory of Nyssa

---

CASIMIR MCCAMBLEY

THE PRACTICE OF USURY HAS ALWAYS POSED A PROBLEM BOTH FOR the ancient Israelites as well as for numerous Fathers of the Church.<sup>1</sup> The book of Exodus (22.25) contains one of the earliest commands with respect to money lending: "If you lend money to any of my people with you who is poor, you shall not be to him as a creditor, and you shall not exact interest from him."<sup>2</sup> This injunction does not condemn usury; rather, it is intended to protect the debtor within the context of tribal consciousness so important to the Israelites. Although the morality of taking interest on money is little or no concern in today's capitalistic oriented society, the homily of Gregory of Nyssa on this subject nevertheless provides us with an illuminating portrait of social justice during the fourth century.<sup>3</sup> Throughout the

---

<sup>1</sup> The New Testament does not explicitly condemn usury. Interest is mentioned in the parable of the talents, Mt 25.27 and Lk 19.23. For two studies on usury during the early Christian period, refer to an article in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 27, no. 3 (Amsterdam, 1973), "The Teaching of the Fathers on Usury: An Historical Study on the Development of Christian Thinking" by Robert P. Maloney, pp. 241-65. The other article is by A. Bernard and may be found in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (Paris, 1950), especially cols. 2323-27. Bernard points out that Clement of Alexandria seems to have been the first Church Father to have condemned the practice of usury (col. 2324).

<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew word for "interest" is *neshek*. This term is derived from the verbal root meaning "to bite" which vividly conveys a negative implication. For more on the verbal root of *neshek*, refer to *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Brown, Driver, Briggs (Oxford; reprint, 1974), p. 675.

<sup>3</sup> The homily against usury should be read in conjunction with two other homilies which have as their theme love for the poor. All three graphically describe the plight

history of Christianity many Church authorities found it difficult to reconcile the practice of loaning money with Gospel principles, and Gregory is no certainly exception.<sup>4</sup> They justified their position through Christ's own words as applied to God the Father: "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Mt 6.12). In fact, Gregory uses this passage in reference to the remission of sin approximately midway thorough his treatise (J. 203.13-14). Thus the practice of placing money at the service of generating interest with the intention of accumulating further capital has always been viewed as being in conflict with Gospel principles.

Among the Fathers of the Greek Church, Basil the Great<sup>5</sup> and his brother Gregory of Nyssa<sup>6</sup> are two notable examples who have provided us with comprehensive statements about moneylending in light of sacred scripture. The former examines the issue from the debtor's point of view and restricts his censure to interest on money. The latter, however, is more concerned with the creditor or person to whom the money is owed. He is firm in his position which prohibits every form of usury, for by it "You hinder the road of life and close the doors to the kingdom [of heaven]" (J 196.16-17). The concluding words of his exhortation reveals deference so typical of Gregory to his elder brother Basil's homily on moneylending: "I remain silent in this matter because our holy father Basil's advice is sufficient. He has wisely and abundantly furnished it in his homily to persons who are foolish enough to make loans out of greed"

---

of destitute persons. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9 (Leiden, 1967), pp. 93-108 and pp. 111-127; PG 46.543-63 and 472-89.

<sup>4</sup>It may be noted that interest-taking was legal throughout the patristic period; nevertheless, Gregory was swift to condemn it.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Homily Twelve, "A Psalm of David against Usurers" in *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 46 (Washington, DC, 1963), pp. 181-91. Trans. Sr. Agnes Clare Way, c.d.p.

<sup>6</sup>Jean Daniélou dates Gregory's homily against usury as occurring in the Lenten season of 379, approximately the same time as his treatise *On the Making of Man*. Daniélou believes that Lent was an appropriate time to mention such topic: "C'est, en effet, au cours du Carême que des sermons du cet ordre étaient généralement donnés." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* no. 29 (Paris, 1955) 348-49. Towards the beginning this important work Gregory alludes to "the rewards of money" which is reminiscent of usury: "If we had to honor with rewards of money those who excel in virtue, the wole world would seem but small to be made equal to your virtue in the balance. However, the debt of gratitude due to your Reverence [Gregory's brother Peter] is greater than can be valued in money" (PG44.125B). These words also allude to Basil's sermon on the subject (PG 29.246C-80C).

(J 207.3-7). The two brothers<sup>7</sup> also refer to the prophet Ezekiel ("You have taken usury and increase, and have made gain of your neighbors by extortion," 22.12), and insist that usury reduces a person to the position of a slave.

Basil provides us with an interesting definition of usury:

Therefore, this form of avarice is considered deserving of this name. For it is called *tokos* [parturition], as, I think, because of the fecundity of the evil. In fact, from where else would it receive its name? Or, perhaps, it is called *tokos* because of the anguish and distress which it is accustomed to produce in the souls of the borrowers. As travail comes to the one who is giving birth, so the appointed day comes to the debtor. There is interest upon interest, the wicked offspring of wicked parents.<sup>8</sup>

Because the Greek word *tokos*<sup>9</sup> has a two-fold meaning, childbirth and interest (usury), it allows Basil to exchange one meaning for another whenever appropriate. The very nature of interest on money is to yield profit . . . give birth . . . to additional income, hence the close association between these two interpretations. Furthermore, usury is the very antithesis to divine goodness which freely bestows grace upon everyone:

You have the pledge of paradise and a worthy token. If you seek further, [you can see that] the entire world is the possession of a fair Debtor who wisely takes care to obtain abundance and wealth. The whole earth is gold and belongs to your debtor; silver and copper and every other material are subject to his authority" (J 198.26-199.2).

It is precisely God's lordship over his creation that provides the chief motive for our generosity and forgiveness. Keeping in mind the

---

<sup>7</sup> Stanislas Giet sums up the position of Basil and Gregory as follows: "Celle de Basile: Fait au riche comme au pauvre, le prêt d'argent, par lui-même, ne donne droit à aucun intérêt. Celle de Grégoire: Tu prêtes à un pauvre (autrement, on n'aurait que faire de tes biens); tu n'es pas fondé à réclamer un bénéfice." *Science Religieuse* 32 (1944) 106.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 187.

<sup>9</sup> For more information on *tokos*, refer to *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* edited by G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford, 1961), p. 1395.

two-meaning of *tokos* mentioned above, we can now see how Gregory interprets this term in his *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*:

Only animate beings have the distinction between male and female. God the Creator said, "Increase, give birth to a succeeding one. But from what kind of marriage does the birth [*tokos*] of gold derive? What sort of conception brings it to fruition? I am aware of the pains belonging to such a birth from the prophet's words, "Behold, he has travelled with unrighteousness, had conceived trouble, and has brought forth iniquity" (Ps 7.14). Such is that birth which avarice yields, iniquity begets, and hate delivers. When urgently pressed, the person who always conceals abundance and swears to have nothing, is pregnant with a purse and begets usury [*tokos*] out of desire for gain. He assumes the misfortune of a moneylender who devotes himself to material gain in the same way a person extinguishes a flame by oil. The calamity of a loan has no remedy; instead, it becomes worse (J.344.16-345.5).

In this passage the bishop of Nyssa contrasts the fertility of nature resulting from the union of man and woman in marriage with its opposite, the birth or *tokos* of greed through usury. With regard to the latter, sterility is the consequence, even though interest on money may increase. In contrast to the natural order of childbirth, the usurer worries himself sick over his loaned money. Gregory vividly compares such apprehension with the sea when, for example, a moneylender anxiously awaits the return of a sailor in his debt:

If the usurer has loaned to a sailor, he would sit on the shore, worry about the wind's movement, constantly examine their diminishment and await the report of a wreck or some other misfortune. His soul is disquieted whenever he sees the sea angered (J.200.5-8).

In contrast to this tumultuous state of mind, Gregory of Nyssa furnishes several important examples of deep faith and trust in God such as Moses, Hannah, and the Virgin Mary (J.200.18-28). All these persons have relied upon God "who is all powerful and does not demand wealth because he provides us with aspirations which transcend all our hopes" (J.200.20-22). Since Gregory wishes his listeners to share their faith, which is so important in the history of salvation, he offers virtue as the one true goal of our aspirations. In fact, the opening paragraph of Gregory's homily perceives virtue (*arete*) in terms

of a mother (J.195.10) which lies in sharp contrast to the *tokos* (birth-usury) of moneylenders soon to be described. The bishop also considers greed through the accumulation (*pleonasmos*) of money to be equally evil as he describes in another place: "Divine Scripture forbids accumulation and usury as well as the appropriation of another person's possessions, even though it is done under the pretext of a contract."<sup>10</sup>

For Gregory, conscience plays an important role in our struggle against sin: "How can you [that is, a usurer] make a request from God in good conscience [*suneidos*] since he has everything and you do not know how to give" (J.201.18-20)? As Walther Völker has pointed out with regard to Gregory's first homily on the resurrection,<sup>11</sup> that we must hold in our hands the spices of faith (*pistis*) and conscience (*suneidesis*) at Christ's grave. Völker criticizes Gregory because he fails to show the relationship between conscience and his theology of image which is so important to him. Thus in his view, Gregory's notions on this important quality remain rudimentary and fragmented, even though conscience for him plays an important part in our rejection of sin.<sup>12</sup>

Völker further points out that although Gregory's concept of virtue (*arete*) is rooted in the Bible, he is nevertheless deeply influenced by Plato.<sup>13</sup> For example, our reasonable part (*logistikos*) stands between the two posts of *epithumia* and *thumos* which are ordered by the action of *arete* as we can see in the following passage from *The Life of Moses*:

While Scripture gives us through figures a scientific understanding

---

<sup>10</sup>*Canonical Epistle*, PG 45.233B.

<sup>11</sup>*Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker* (Wiesbaden, 1955), p. 105. Völker remarks that the essence of a good conscience reveals itself in relation to other persons: "Es wird seinem Wesen nach des Näheren dahin bestimmt, daß man sich keines Bösen bewußt ist, und es verbindet sich stets mit *eleutheria* [freedom] und *parresia* [openness of speech], einer Seelenhaltung, die dem Vollkommenen eigentümlich ist."

<sup>12</sup>pp. 105-06. "For the law of the Spirit forbids the entry of such things [unclean thoughts] unless the person who has entertained some dead, abominable thought washes the garment of his conscience according to Moses' prescription (Num 19.11)." *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, J.45.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid*, p. 132-33. "Der intellektualistischen Fassung der griechischen Ethik überhaupt entspricht die Erkenntnis, daß alles Tun sich auf eine Urteilsbildung gründe, auf die *episteme*, die zwischen Gut und Böse zu unterscheiden wies."

of the nature of the soul, profane learning [that is, Plato] also places it before the mind, dividing the soul into the rational [*to logistikon*]<sup>14</sup>, the appetitive [*to epithumian*], and the spiritual [*to thumeoides*]. Of these parts we are told that the spirit and the appetite are placed below, supporting on each side the intellectual part of the soul, while the rational aspect is joined to both so as to keep them together and to be held up by them, being trained for courage by the spirit and elevated to the participation in the Good by the appetite.<sup>15</sup>

Gregory's homily against usury clearly demonstrates how greed has distorted the above mentioned nature of the soul through an unbridled appetite for material gain. As Jean Daniélou indicates, we are confronted with two fundamental directions, towards God and towards vice. It is not a question here of philosophical speculation but of moral principles based upon the Gospel, although Gregory's philosophical training provides a better means to comprehend this ethical dilemma.<sup>16</sup> In his own words, "Fascination with trivial matters makes your ears tingle and subjects you to eternal distress" (J.196.17-18). Material possessions cause such enthrallment, especially interest on money gained at the expense of the poor, and makes the usurer "secure a pledge of poverty" (J.196.29) for himself. Jerome Gaith has observed that this social aspect of Gregory's teaching has been profoundly influenced by Stoicism which considers sympathy as the fundamental law of the cosmos in general and of humanity in particular.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, society can be fettered by custom which, in turn, affects an individual person's behavior for the worse.

---

<sup>14</sup>Compare this passage with the opening words of the homily against usury: "Persons who love virtue [*ton philarton*] live in accord with reason [*zen kata logon*] by following beneficial laws and ordinances."

<sup>15</sup>Translation by Abraham Malherbe and Everett Ferguson (New York, 1978), pp. 76-77. For a better understanding of this three-fold classification, refer to Plato's *Republic* (439d, 588b).

<sup>16</sup>Cf. *Platonisme et Théologie Mystique* (Paris, 1944), p. 71.

<sup>17</sup>"Le macrocosme humain n'est que l'homme agrandi et projeté à l'extérieur. A l'inverse, tous ces mouvements, par un phénomène de réflexion, convergent dans chaque individu, microcosme accordé à l'universelle vibration. Cette fusion dynamique oriente l'individu, soit vers le renouvellement intérieur et l'affranchissement, moral, soit vers la perversion et la servitude, suivant que le milieu lui-même est bon ou mauvais. Or, pour Grégoire, ce milieu, en son ensemble, est essentiellement corrompu." *La Liberté chez Grégoire de Nyssa* (Paris, 1953), p. 124.

In Gregory's own words, persons are generally divided into two groups: "One is inimical to wickedness while the other favors good deeds" (J.195.5-7). The former contains moneylenders who are at the extreme end of depravity since they feed off defenseless persons. He passionately beckons them, "Love man, not riches" (J.196.10-11), and in his fifth homily on *The Lord's Prayer*, Gregory takes a similar position by saying, "If you dismiss corporeal debts, you will loosen the bonds of your soul."<sup>18</sup>

Not only does the bishop of Nyssa perceive social injustice but he sees also a real alienation in our failure to take corrective action. For a vivid description of this alienation, refer to a text taken from the *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*:

What about deceived persons who cling to gold with their whole heart even though such possessions trouble their consciences? What do they promise themselves when they have something of so great of value? If they could change gold's substance, would they also desire to change their humanity into gold, a substance which lacks reason, intelligence and sensation? . . . Not only do they carry this out, but they fail to see how it differs from the fruit [*tokos*] of evil thoughts, robbery, or murder. For how does a burglar differ from other robbers when he establishes himself as lord by committing murder or when he possesses what does not belong to him through usury [*tokos*] (J.343-44)?

Thus wealth necessarily transforms itself into a means of oppression which must be eliminated first from ourselves and then from other persons who are victims of our corrupt thoughts and actions:

We must first pull down in us the buildings of evil and then find a space to construct a temple for God in our souls whose material is virtue. . . . Ecclesiastes first bids us to destroy such things and then to make the gold of virtue material for constructing the spiritual house (*Ecclesiastes*, J.385).

In Gaïth's view, these "buildings of evil" represent "une conséquence de la déchéance originelle,"<sup>19</sup> whose destruction paves the

---

<sup>18</sup>PG 44.1188D.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid. p. 129.

way for correct moral behavior in accord with Gospel principles. Although Gregory's homily against usurers does not explicitly speak of man as being made in God's image or *eikon*, it nevertheless says that his substance is "composed of copper and gold" (J.200.29), qualities analogous to this image.<sup>20</sup> Realization of our divine birthright is crucial since it provides the motive for avoiding profit at the expense of persons in need.

### THE TEXT<sup>21</sup>

[J.195 & M.433] Persons who love virtue live in accord with reason by following beneficial laws and ordinances. Two general characteristics belonging to lawgivers distinguish such persons: one is inimical to wickedness while the other favors good deeds. A person cannot otherwise live well and temperately unless he has virtue for a mother and puts evil to flight. Hence we are assembled today to hear God's commands and to pay close attention to the prophet [Ezekiel]. He slew the evil of moneylending whose child is usury and has banished from his life money gained through trade (Ezk 22.12). Let us patiently accept [God's] commandment and avoid becoming that rock upon which the seed fell, dried up, and remained fruitless (Lk 8.13). Neither should the words spoken to the obdurate Israelites apply to us, "You hear yet you do not understand, and look yet you do not see" (Is 6.10).

I ask my listeners neither to condemn my audacity nor lack of understanding when they hear a person like me, skilled in speaking and philosophy and trained in every type of learning, because I have forsaken anything to do with [M.436] usury. I will now [J.196] descend to the contest at hand; although I may be yoked to an ass or an ox, I am nevertheless crowned with victory which has been ob-

---

<sup>20</sup>In his homily *Concerning Almsgiving*, Gregory refers to persons afflicted by poverty since they resemble those in debt to usurers. Nevertheless, mankind is made in God's image even though external circumstances have disfigured its *eikon*: "The appearances we see are uncertain, for neither what distinguishes him as a living being is pure nor is it characteristic of one. If you offer a conjecture about man, you would reject his character as unsightly" (J.116).

<sup>21</sup>The critical text of "Against Those Who Practice Usury" was edited by Ernest Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. ix (Leiden, 1967), pp. 195-207. Reference to this edition is designated within the translation by the letter "J" followed by the page number. The letter "M," also followed by a page number, refers to the edition of PG 46.433-52.



tained by a horse. The small always appears with the great and the luminous moon with the radiant sun. A merchant ship is carried along by the wind and a small sun. A merchant ship is carried along by the wind and a small boat traverses the deep; trained athletes as well as youths sprinkle sand over themselves before wrestling. With this in mind, our comments should invite your reflection.

You whom I address, whomever you are, forsake the habits of a petty thief. Love man, not riches, and resist this type of sin. Say with John the Baptist to those who love usury, "Depart from me, 'you brood of vipers' " (Mt 3.7). You are cursed by those who have you at their disposal. Although you allow a trifling [pleasure] to delight you now, a poisonous serpent later brings harm upon your soul. You hinder the road of life and close the doors to the kingdom [of heaven]. Fascination with trivial matters makes your ears tingle and subjects you to eternal distress. The following words which pertain to accumulation [of wealth] and usury ought to inspire your love for the poor: "Do not refuse him who would borrow from you" (Mt 5.42). The destitute person is making supplication and is seated outside your door; in his need he seeks your wealth to bring relief. However, you do just the opposite and turn him into an adversary. You fail to assist him and free him from necessity while you indulge in personal wealth. Furthermore, you sow evils in this afflicted wretch, remove the clothes from his nakedness, cause him harm and heap one care and grief upon another. Whoever takes money from the practice of usury secures a pledge of poverty and brings harm upon his home through a superficial good deed. A [J.197] person burning with fever has an unquenchable thirst and earnestly begs wine. Although the cup given him out of charity satisfies for a while, the raging fever soon returns [M.437] with a ten-fold vengeance. Thus whoever lends money to a destitute person intensifies his misery instead of relieving distress.

Do not live with feigned charity nor be a murderous physician with the pretense to heal for a profit; if you do this, a person trusting in your skill can suffer great harm. Moneylending had no value and is rapacious. It is unfamiliar with such trades as agriculture and commerce; like a beast, usury dwells in one place and delights in banquets. Moneylending wants everything to be wild and begets whatever has been untilled. It has a reed for a plough, papyrus for a field, and black ink for seed. Rain and the passage of time yield money while the scythe demands compensation. Usury's home is a threshing-floor upon which the fortunes of the oppressed are winnowed and where

it considers everything as its own. It prays for afflictions and misfortunes in order to destroy such persons. Moneylending despises people contented with their possessions and treats them as enemies because they do not provide money. It watches courts of law to find distress in persons who demand payment and follows tax collectors who are a nest of vultures in battle array prepared for war. Moneylending carries a purse and dangles bait as a wild beast to those in distress [J.198] in order to ensnare them in their need. Daily it counts gain and cannot be satisfied. It is vexed by gold hidden in a person's home because it remains idle and unprofitable. Usury imitates farmers who immediately plant crops; it takes and gives money without gain while transferring it from one hand to another. You often see wealth and riches among persons who lack a single coin. Instead their hope lies in a piece of paper which represents their wealth by mutual agreement; these persons have nothing yet possess everything. On the other hand we have the Apostle's admonition concerning persons who give not through charity but out of greed (cf. Mt 5.42). Usury opts for a convenient form of destitution in order to have money as a constantly toiling slave. In this manner moneylending obtains what it has lent out. You can thus observe how hope for the future empties one's house and renders temporary wealth useless.

How does this situation arise? Anything written on paper is guaranteed [M.440] to engender distress; you lend with interest and must repay what you have gained. I am exhorting you now because an indebted person is helpless and held by a bond, whereas God who is rich and trustworthy will hear you (Lk 6.30). The Gospel encourages us to give and make restitution with regard to any recorded public debt (Lk 6.38). It speaks of a document written by four people instead of a contract by one person whose testimony belongs to all Christians starting from the time of their salvation. You have the pledge of paradise and a worthy token. If you seek further [you can see that] the entire world is the possession of a fair Debtor who wisely takes care to obtain abundance and wealth. The whole earth is gold and belongs to your Debtor; [J.199] silver, copper and every other material are subject to his authority. Consider the sky's expanse, examine the boundless sea, learn from the earth's magnitude and count the living beings which it nourishes. All are subject and belong to him who transcends your comprehension. Oh, man, pay close attention. Do not insult God nor reckon him to be worse than a money-changer. Make a pledge to him who is immortal and believe in his reliable bond which

can never be sundered. Do not demand gain but give bountifully and without corruption (cf. Prov 19.17). Then you will see God who abundantly dispenses his grace.

If these words astonish you, God himself is a reliable witness because his compensation is most generous. He [Christ] responds to Peter's inquiry, "See, we have left everything and have followed you, What then shall we have?" [Christ] answers, "Truly I say to you that everyone who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands, will receive a hundred-fold and will inherit eternal life" (Mt 19.27f-f). Are you aware of his generosity and goodness? The money-lender labors without shame in order to double his capital while God freely bestows a hundred-fold to the person who does not afflict his brother. Thus anyone advised to trust in God does not harm by refusing to indulge in usury. Why do you harm yourself with anxiety by [M.441] calculating days, months, the sum of money, dreaming of profit, and fearing the appointed day whose fruitful harvest brings hail? The moneylender is inquisitive with regard to the activities of the person in his debt as well as his personal travels, activities, movements, and livelihood. If he hears a bad report about anyone who has fallen among thieves or whose good fortune has changed to [M.200] destitution, the moneylender sits with folded hands, groans continuously, weeps much, rolls up the written bond, laments the gold it represents, and makes a contract which cuts off his son as though he were a garment. Such an impatient disposition results in obsession. If the usurer has loaned to a sailor, he would sit on the shore, worry about the wind's movement, constantly examine their diminishment and await the report of a wreck or some other misfortune. His soul is disquieted whenever he sees the sea angered; he examines dreams and reveals his disposition through the events which had transpired during the day. With regard to this attitude we are obliged to say, "Do not allow, oh man, anxiety to disturb you nor the desire for gain. Do not seek monetary interest nor let the accumulation of money corrupt you. Associate with the poor and amass their wealth if you wish to receive abundance of wheat from a parched field, cluster from the vine after hail has rained down upon them, children from a barren womb, or nourishing milk from childless women." We are all familiar with these experiences, so there is no reason to humiliate anyone. God alone is all powerful and does not demand wealth because he provides us with aspirations which transcend all our hopes. He summons a spring to gush from the rock

(Ex 17.6), rains down from heaven a new and wondrous bread (Ex 16.15), sweetens the bitter water by a rod, sends a child to barren Elizabeth (Lk 1.13), gives Samuel to Hannah (1 Sam 1.20), and the First Born to Mary in her virginity (Lk 2.7). All these come from the hand of the all powerful [God].

Since you are composed of copper and gold, do not seek usury, force poverty upon those who are rich, nor [J.201] be greedy to persons asking for money. Are you not aware that the need for a loan is a request for mercy cheerfully bestowed? For this reason the [divine] law constantly advises us with regard to piety and [M.444] prohibits usury: "If you lend money to your brother, you must not be too hard" (Ex 22.25). Grace is a fountain of abundant generosity which prescribes remission of a fine as the following words say: "If you make a loan, you hope to gain" (cf. Lk 6.34), and in another parable, "[That servant] violently oppressed his fellow servant who pleaded that he could not pay him. Neither did he remit one hundred denarii, a small debt, when he had received remission for a thousand talents (Mt 18.28-34)." As Teacher of our faith, our Savior introduced a model of prayer and simple practice to his disciples when he initiated them with words of supplication befitting God: "And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" (Mt 6.12). How can you pray like this, oh usurer? How can you make a request from God in good conscience since he has everything and [M.445] you do not know how to give? Do you not know that your prayer consists of contemptuous words? What do you give and what remission do you request? To whom do you show mercy and call it mercy? If you demonstrate compassion, hostility and hatred? Is it not from the misfortunes, tears and lamentations of others? If the poor man had known the source of his offer regarding mercy, he would not have taken it as tasting his brother's flesh and the blood of his relatives. He would wisely say to your forthright words, "Do not, oh man, sustain yourself on your brother's tears [J.202] and do not give as food to the hungry the groans of those who have suffered calamity. Restore to your brother what you have wickedly stolen and be compassionate. What purpose is there in afflicting many people with poverty while you comfort one individual? If usury does not abound, then a multitude of destitute persons would cease to exist. Dissolve your claim and be generous in everything. Condemn all money lenders because they lack healing through the Law, prophets, and evangelists." The holy Amos says, "Hear this, you who oppress the poor in the morning and drive

the needy of the earth saying, 'When will the month pass away that we may sell?' " (Amos 8.4-5). Neither will fathers rejoice over their sons as when money lenders rejoice at the completion of the months [for exacting interest].

[Moneylenders] label sin with fine names such as profit in imitation of the Greeks who call upon demons or hateful murderers instead of their true name, Eumenides [the gracious goddesses]. Kindness consists in not inflicting burdensome interest upon one's brethren, distributing wealth, and extending a generous hand to slaves who have little happiness at the beginning [of their bondage] and suffer bitterly later on in life. Usurers may be compared to persons intent upon catching birds. At first birds delight in scattered seeds; they frequent these places of abundant food and then perish in nets. So it is with persons who receive a large amount of loaned money; for a short time they have it in abundance and are later deprived of their paternal [J.203] home. Mercy abandons those defiled and greedy souls who are not at all moved to pity when they see a debtor's home up for sale. Instead they beg [M.448] for the sale to pass in order to make a quick profit and bind themselves more tightly to another person's misery through the person who had made the loan. They [moneylenders] are like insatiable hunters who have encircled one particular valley with nets. Having caught everything there, they take their nets to another nearby valley and repeat the process until every place is devoid of prey.

If you resemble such persons, how can you look up to heaven? How can you ask for the remission of sin? Are you doing in an imprudent manner what the Savior has taught, "Forgive us our debts as we have forgiven our debtors" (Mt 6.12)? So many people are ensnared through usury and cast themselves headlong into torrential rivers! This is a more tolerable death than [being indebted to] a moneylender who has abandoned his children as orphans and has destitution as an evil stepmother. But exacting usurers do not spare an abandoned home; instead, they pursue the inheritors whose only possession may be a noose and seek gold which to them is food taken from a banquet. When they have been reproached, as for example, at the death of a debtor and are ashamed at very mention of a noose, they neither hide nor are terrified; instead, they speak without shame in their bitterness. Is this injustice intrinsic to our [human] nature because destiny has determined an ill-fated, senseless and miserable birth ending in cruel death? Moneylenders like to philosophize and

show themselves disciples of Egyptian magicians whenever one of them makes supplication for their abominable deeds in defense of [J.204] such murderous behavior. They speak to each other as follows: "You were born in ignominy and are subject to the evil coercion of the stars. If you encourage mercy, dismiss part of a debt, and acquire a part with remission, you will not despise life as burdensome nor partake of it. Then with what eyes will you see what is condemned to death at the resurrection? You will come to the judgment seat of Christ where usuries are not counted but where lives are judged. You will respond to the incorruptible Judge when he says to you, 'You have the Law, prophets, and Gospels.' Have you heard them cry out in one voice about love and compassion saying, 'To your brother you will not lend interest' (Dt 23.20), 'He has not given his money on usury' (Ps 14.5), 'If you loan [M.449] to your brother, you will not be hard upon him' (Ex 22.24)? But Matthew proclaims the Lord's words in parables: 'You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt because you besought me, and should you not have had mercy on your fellow servant, as I had mercy on you? And in anger his lord delivered him to the torturers until he should pay all his debt' (Mt 18.32-34). Then an ineffective repentance accompanied by heavy groans and the inevitability of punishment will seize you. In no way will gold assist you nor silver defend you since the distribution of loaned money is a more bitter wrath. These words are not intended to strike fear; rather, they are honest deeds which testify to the trial at court and should be well guarded by prudence and foresight."

Pay close attention now in order that you may profit from what we are about to say with regard to God's judgment and the times in which we are living. Perhaps many of you are familiar with the subject matter we are about to present.

A certain man lived in a city (I will not mention his name to avoid ridiculing the dead) who was a usurer and profited from moneylending. He was miserly in his passion for money and for what he had spent (this is how persons who love money behave). His table never had enough food, and he always had sufficient clothing and other possessions. This man failed to provide his children with life's necessities and was reluctant to take a bath out of fear of paying three obols. Furthermore, he was constantly intent upon accumulating more and more money. He was not satisfied with letting his son, slave banker, key, and seal guard his purse. Instead this usurer kept his money in cracks in the wall and plastered over the outside with mud

to hide it. He moved his treasure from place to place and from wall to wall, thereby skillfully concealing it. When he suddenly departed this life, he revealed the hidden money to no family member. Once he was buried, his gain remained hidden. But his children hoped to achieve greater prominence in the city. They searched everywhere for his wealth, questioned other persons, inquired among family members, opened the floors of homes, hollowed out walls, annoyed neighbors and friends, and moved every stone. As the saying goes, his children did not find a single obol. They went through [M.452] this present existence homeless and destitute while each day loathing their father's inflated vanity.

Such is your friend and companion, oh moneylenders! You have indeed ended your life with its vain pursuit of usury. Pains and hunger trouble you as you accumulate an inheritance of [J.206] eternal punishment and leave your children penniless. Neither are you aware for whom you have gathered or toiled so hard. There are numerous people who make false accusations, lay ambushes and commit robbery on both land and sea. See that you refrain from acquiring sins or gold. These words constitute a somber warning (for I know that you are murmuring under your teeth) because they continuously regulate our manner of life and conspire to make us poor through good deeds. Be aware that we can no longer engage in moneylending. How do such deprived persons live? Our words suit their deeds and offer a sound argument for persons shadowed by wealth's gloom. Since they lack firm resolve and do not perceive our advice, they focus attention upon the opposite. You would think that I wanted them to refrain from lending money because with murmuring under their lips, they threaten to shut their doors to persons in need. For my part, I loudly proclaim acts of charity. I first advocate making loans (in the second place, loaning is a form of giving) without profit through moneylending as the divine word has decreed (cf. Lk 6.35). Equally pernicious is the person who does not loan and gives with usury since he is judged as a hateful, dishonest trader. Those who resort to the other extreme disguise themselves under the pretext of giving. This is indeed shameless behavior and an impudent challenge to justice which makes them contentious and hostile towards God. Such a person says, "I will neither give nor make a contract without loaning interest."

Our words pertaining to usury should suffice because the example of persons condemned in [J.207] court is adequate for me. May God bestow repentance upon them. But those who are quick to loan and

pierce themselves with hooks of moneylending, recklessly harm their own lives. I remain silent in this matter because our holy father Basil's advice is sufficient. He has wisely and abundantly furnished it in his homily to persons who are foolish enough to make loans out of greed.



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Reviews

---

*Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook.* Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Edited by Vincent L. Wimbush. Foreword by James M. Robinson. Preface by Elizabeth A. Clark. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Frontispiece. Pp. xxvii + 514. Hardbound. \$41.95.

*Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, edited by an Associate Professor of New Testament at the School of Theology at Claremont and at the Claremont Graduate School, is better described as the result of the collaborative efforts of nearly thirty scholars and members of the Society of Biblical Group on Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity, whose interests cut across Judaism, Christianity, and philosophy and religion. The current project is intended to improve on and relace older assumptions made about Christian asceticism (for example, that early Judaism was basically antiascetic or that Christian asceticism was a response to the moral depravity present i Roman paganism). The volume draws on Coptic and Syriac materials as well as Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, and includes ascetic development in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The material included here will enable the reader to catch a glimpse of the social worlds of the average inhabitant of the Roman Empire through sermons, magical texts, and documents that embrace recent papyrological and archaeological discoveries. This volume stresses asceticism's appeal for women as well as for men and is "ecumenical" in approach.

The editor, in his Introduction, indicates that the aim of this massive source book is "to make accessible in English translation a number of interesting texts that will introduce the reader to a wide range of different types of ascetic piety as different understandings of, and reposnses to, the Greco-Roman world. As a collection of texts,

the volume was not intended to be the definitive statement about or sourcebook for asceticism—not in Greco-Roman antiquity, much less in any other culture or period in history” (p. 1). The selections are meant to give the reader an idea of representative types of ascetic piety. No overall definition of asceticism is attempted but a wide variety of practices are described. Each text selection is preceded by an introduction by an expert and includes information on authorship, date of composition, literary genre, audience, and a summary description of the ascetic piety prescribed (or even proscribed). The general thesis is that “*ascetic behavior represents a range of responses to social, political, and physical worlds often perceived as oppressive or unfriendly or as stumbling blocks to the pursuit of heroic personal or communal goals, life styles, and commitments*” (p. 2). This is hardly an assumption that many traditionalists would accept as overriding the basically *religious* commitment of ascetics of all kinds. It is acknowledged that Greek philosophy provided the language and conceptualization of Greek and much of the Roman asceticism and that the notions of *sophrosyne* and *enkrateia* were particularly important.

The twenty-eight texts in *Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity* are organized in five principle parts corresponding to five literary types: (1) “Homily”; (2) “Philosophical/Theological Exhortation”; (3) “Ritual/Revelation”; (4) “Life and Teachings”; and (5) “Documentary Evidence.” There is a short list of suggested titles for further reading and research at the end of each text and, at the end of the book, there is a useful bibliography preceded by extensive chronological tables and followed by indexes of ancient sources and of subjects and names.

Included in this anthology are homilies by Jacob of Serug *On Symeon the Stylite* (Susan Ashbrook Harvey); *On Virginity* (Teresa M. Shaw); by Origen on *Ezekiel* (Joseph W. Trigg); *On Hermits and Desert Dwellers* (Joseph P. Amar); and by Pseudo-Macarius the Egyptian on *Homily IV* (Richard Valantasis). “Philosophical and Theological Exhortations” include Ambrosiaster, *On the Sin of Adam and Eve* (David G. Hunter); *Cynic Epistles: Selections* (Leif E. Vaage); Musonius Rufus, *On Training: Discourse VI* (Leif E. Vaage); Philo, *On the Contemplative Life: Or, On the Suppliants: The Fourth Book on the Virtues* (Gail Paterson Corrington); Julian of Eclanum, *To Florus* (Elizabeth Clark); Stobaeus: *Anthology: Excerpts* (Vincent L. Wimbush); Evagrius Pontius, *The Kephalaia Gnostica* (David Bundy); Coptic Manichaean on *Kephalaia of the Teacher: Selections* (Michael

H. Browder); and *The Nazirite in Ancient Judaism: Selected Texts* (Steven D. Fraade).

"The Ritual and Revelation" section includes *Hēkalôt Rabbatī* 297-306: *A Ritual for the Cultivation of the Prince of the Torah* (Michael D. Swartz); *Allogenes: Nag Hammadi Codex XI 3* (Richard Valantasis); and Evagrius Ponticus, *Antirrheticus: Selections* (Michael O'Laughlin). The "Life and Teachings" sections draws from Pseudo-Athanasius, *The Life and Activity of the Holy and Blessed Teacher Syncretica* (Elizabeth A. Castelli); Zacharias, *The Life of Severus* (Robin A. Darling Young); Ethiopian Moses, *Collected Sources* (Kathleen O'Brien Wicker); *Theodore's Entry Into the Pachomian Movement: Selections from the Life of Pachomius* (James E. Goehring); Jerome, *Life of Paul, The First Hermit* (Paul B. Harvey, Jr.); *The Story of Mygdonia and Tertia from Acts of Thomas* (Virginia Burrus and Karen Jo Torjesen); Chaeremon the Stoic on Egyptian Temple Askesis: From Porphyry, *On Abstinence* 4:6-8 (Anitra Bingham Kolenkow); and *The Life of Chariton* (Leah DiSegni).

The "Documentary Evidence" contains the richly illustrated "*Life of Chariton: In Light of Archaeological Research*" by Yizhar Herschfeld; "Canons from the Council of Gangra" (introduced by James E. Goehring and translated by Robert F. Boughner).

*Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity* is the product of a scholarly attempt to provide an integrated view of a subject whose diversity reflects complexity rather than simplicity. It is a book that is intended as a resource for historians, and social scientists as well as for ancient historians, theologians, and patristic scholars. The translations as a whole are very well done; the individual introductions often involve interpretations that are often *au courant* and will need careful reexamination and exegesis. The whole project is intended to be objective in as scholarly a way as possible.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe.* Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. xv + 404. Hardbound. \$36.95.

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians* is a Festschrift honoring Abraham

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Being Transformed: Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans\*

---

METROPOLITAN DEMETRIOS TRAKATELLIS

"AS I KEEP HEARING THE EPISTLES OF THE BLESSED PAUL READ, and that twice every week, and often three and four times, whenever we are celebrating the memorials of the holy martyrs, gladly do I enjoy the spiritual trumpet, and get roused and warmed with desire at recognizing the voice so dear to me, and seem to fancy him (i.e. Paul) all but present to my sight, and behold him conversing with me. But I grieve and am pained (ἀλγῶ καὶ ὀδυνῶμαι) that all people do not know Paul as much as they ought to know him; but some are so far ignorant of him, as not even to know clearly the number of his Epistles. And this comes not of incapacity of learning (ἀμαθία) but of their not having the wish to be continually conversing with this blessed man. For it is not through any cleverness (εὐφροσύνη) and sharpness of mind that even I am acquainted with as much as I do know, if I do know anything, but owing to a continual cleaving (συνεχῶς ἔχεσθαι) to Paul and an earnest affection (σφόδρα διακεισθαι) toward him . . . And so, you also, if you be willing to apply to the reading of him with a ready mind, will need no other aid . . ."<sup>1</sup>

\* Major parts of this paper were presented in "The Martin Rist Lecture of New Testament" at Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado, on April 3, 1989, and in "The Holy Cross Alumni Lecture" at Hellenic College-Holy Cross School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts, on May 17, 1991.

<sup>1</sup> John Chrysostom, *Exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans* (Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Ἐπιστολήν) Introductory homily, Migne, PG 60.391. All references to

These are the opening lines of the introductory homily of St. John Chrysostom to his series of 32 exegetical homilies on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. These lines immediately show that Chrysostom embarks upon his interpretation of Romans with a strong sense of a close, intense connection with Paul, with a passionate love for the Apostle of the Gentiles. The very same prelude also reveals Chrysostom's painful awareness of the fact that his audience is not exactly on the same level of feelings and knowledge. He seems, however, to be conscious of the possibility offered to his listeners for a change, for a deeper acquaintance with Paul and his message, and, ultimately, for a transformation of their own beings and lives.

Chrysostom's 32 exegetical homilies on Romans constitute a masterpiece of biblical commentary. As J. Quasten stated, "They are by far the most outstanding Patristic commentary on Romans and the finest of all Chrysostom's works."<sup>2</sup> This is a work that proceeds in a methodical analysis and a brilliantly insightful exegesis of the Pauline text, chapter after chapter, verse by verse. Technical, historical, and linguistic observations go hand in hand with the theological interpretation and pastoral application. The language is rich and the exposition is dominated by a tremendous God-centered anthropological passion. A passion, nonetheless, which is well controlled and balanced, and which does not interfere with the precision, the clarity, and the subtlety of the exegesis.

Chrysostom touches upon all the major themes encountered in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. His focus, however, is not so much on the purely dogmatic theological issues as it is on the anthropological ones. He is profoundly, consistently, and totally engaged in the astonishing anthropological aspects revealed in the text of Romans. He reads Paul's major epistle as a document in which *ἄνθρωπος*, the human being, is the center of attention.

To be sure, Chrysostom does not present in his interpretation of Romans an abstract general anthropological theory, nor an understanding of the human being in a static, passive condition. He rather

---

Chrysostom's text are from Migne's edition. For the English rendering, I have used the translation by J. B. Morris and W. H. Simcox (revised by G. B. Stevens) under the title *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, published in the series of the "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. 11 (Grand Rapids, MI, repr. 1980).

<sup>2</sup> Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, Vol. 3 (Utrecht, 1966), p. 442.

views ἄνθρωπος in the energizing light of salvation, he views every human being in a dynamic condition, in a state of changing, becoming, being transformed. Hence the Chrysostomic interpretation of Romans offers extremely insightful ideas on the potential for and the reality of human change. A change related always to God, always to faith in Christ. In the pages that follow we intend to touch upon some of the most significant of Chrysostom's ideas pertaining to human transformation, as they surface in the process of his exegesis on Romans. They are exegetically and anthropologically very valuable and stimulating in our effort to understand the Epistle to the Romans and to understand ourselves.

### *The Negative Human Reality*

It should be clarified from the outset that Chrysostom's exegesis on Romans does not display an idealized and unreal understanding of the human existence. On the contrary, he uses every occasion to show his awareness of the low, decadent, and deplorable condition in which human beings find themselves at any given moment. Let us illustrate this point with a few examples which involve people in general but also — and this is significant — people of his own congregation.

Already in his introductory homily, Chrysostom speaks about a spiritual state of sluggishness and sleep (νωθεία καὶ ὕπνος) which appears to characterize members of his community.<sup>3</sup> At the end of his 5th homily (on Romans 2), he addresses his audience with the following words: "God needs nothing of what is ours and in spite of that, he does not cease loving us. We need much of what belongs to him, and for all that we cleave not unto his love, but we prefer money instead of him. And people's friendship, and comfort of body, and power, and fame we value above him who values nothing more than us (τοῦ μηδὲν ἡμῶν προτιμῶντος)."<sup>4</sup>

In his 8th homily (on Romans 4), Chrysostom sharpens his critique: "I am in mourning (πενθῶ), that living as we do among brethren, we need be on our guard to avoid being harmed; and we light up so many fires, and set guards and outposts! The reason is the prevalence of falsehood (πολὺ τὸ ψεῦδος), the prevalence of deceit (πολὺς ὁ δόλος), the prevailing secession of love (πολλὴ τῆς ἀγάπης ἡ ἀναίρεσις), and the ruthless, unceasing war (πόλεμος ἄσπονδος). As a result, one

<sup>3</sup> Chrysostom, *On Romans* Introductory Homily; PG 60.394.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Homily 5; PG 60.432.



may find people who feel more confidence in Gentiles than in Christians!’<sup>5</sup> “We are cruel and savage (ἀπηνεῖς καὶ ὠμοί),” he will add at the conclusion of his 23rd homily.<sup>6</sup>

In other instances, like for example when he interprets the passage Romans 12.1-3, Chrysostom uses a combination of rhetorical questions in the second-person singular with irony and exaggeration in order to depict human decadence and misery: “Why do you (arrogantly) stiffen up your neck? Why do you walk on tiptoe (ἐπ’ ἄκρων ὀνύχων)? Why do you knit up your brows? Why do you stick your breast up (τὸ στῆθος φουσᾷς)? You cannot make one hair of your head white or black (Mt 5.36) and you appear as if you rule over everything and everybody (ὡς πάντων κρατῶν) when you simply walk the air (ἀεροβατεῖς). No doubt you would like to even grow wings so that you would not have to walk upon the earth at all. No doubt you wish you could be a wonder person (τέρας). But now you have become indeed a monster (τέρας)<sup>7</sup> since being human you try to fly (πέτασθαι ἐπιχειρῶν). Or rather you are flying from within while you are bloated all over (πετόμενος ἔνδοθεν καὶ φλεγμαίνων πάντοθεν). What shall I call you in order to help you tear down your madness? If I call you ashes and dust and smoke and pother (τέφραν καὶ κόνιν καὶ καπνὸν καὶ χονιορτόν), I have described your worthlessness but still I have not laid hold of the exact image I wanted . . . What image am I to find then which will suit with all this? To me (the kind of people I am talking about) are like a burned up tow (στυπῖω καταφλεχθέντι). For it seems to swell when burned and to lift itself up; with the slightest touch of the hand, however, it all tumbles down and it turns out to be more worthless than the veriest ashes (τέφρας ἀπάσης εὐτελέστερον ἐφάνη).’’<sup>8</sup>

Sometimes Chrysostom would not hesitate to express his painful awareness of the low spiritual state of his listeners even though what he saw might have given a different impression. At the epilogue of homily 22, for instance, sensing the elated mood of his audience he exclaims: “I know well that you are warmed thoroughly now (οἶδα ὅτι διεθερμάνθητε), and that you have become softer than wax (κηροῦ

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.465.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. Homily 23; PG 60.622.

<sup>7</sup> Here Chrysostom offers a word play, using the term τέρας in its two different meanings, namely, “marvel,” “wonder,” and “sign” on the one hand, and “monster” or “monstrosity” on the other.

<sup>8</sup> Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 20; PG 60.601.

παντός ἀπαλώτεροι). But when you leave (this church) you will spurt it all out (ἀναχωρήσαντες ἅπαντα ἀποβλύζετε). This is why I am in deep pain (διὰ τοῦτο ἀλγῶ)."<sup>9</sup>

I have deliberately avoided using examples in which Chrysostom describes the abysmal ugliness and utter decadence of human beings when they are alienated from God and totally immersed in sin and evil. Such descriptions could perhaps be perceived as rhetorical and general, dictated either by particular passages like Romans 1.26-32 or by the commonly established ethico-religious language of the time. I have rather preferred some illustrations and some spontaneous remarks of Chrysostom, because they show that he is even visually and audibly in contact with the negative human condition as he speaks to his flock. It is significant then that he is incessantly striving to show the possibilities for transformation and radical change on both the moral and religious levels to the very people who by their own low spiritual condition simply tend to frustrate any attempt at transformation.

### *Προαίρεσις*

From the very beginning to the very end of his exegesis on Romans, Chrysostom is eager to maintain a principle of synergy. Throughout his 32 homilies, he consistently keeps a concurrent focus on both the human factor and the divine factor involved in the process of human salvation and, by extension, of human transformation. For this reason, next to the terms "grace of God," "righteousness of God," "gift of God," indicative of the divine action, he uses the basic anthropological term *προαίρεσις* or one of its synonyms, which for him constitutes a tremendously important and decisive human factor operative in any transformational interactions.

*Προαίρεσις* means free choice, deliberate choice, purposeful selection, free resolve. This is a word already known through the classical tradition (e.g. Plato and Aristotle),<sup>10</sup> and also through some early ecclesiastical authors who preceded Chrysostom (e.g. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tatian, Origen, Athanasios the Great, Gregory of Nyssa).<sup>11</sup> In Chrysostom, however, and more specifically in his

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. Homily 22; PG 60.614.

<sup>10</sup> See, for instance, Plato, *Parmenides*, 143C, Aristotle, *Politica*, 1280a34.

<sup>11</sup> See, for instance, Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 88.5; Clement Alex. *Stromateis* 4.6; Tatian, *Discourse to the Greeks* 7; Origen, *On Principles* 3.1.24; Athanasios the Great, *On the Incarnation* 3.4; Gregory of Nyssa, *Catechetical Oration* 30.

exegesis on Romans, *προαίρεσις* becomes a high frequency term, implying a combination or mixture of volitional, intellectual, and emotional elements. *Προαίρεσις* for Chrysostom is the very core of *ἄνθρωπος*, his inalienable faculty and the very essence of his genuine identity. *Προαίρεσις* offers, on the human side, an indispensable agent for the transformation of *ἄνθρωπος*. This is probably the reason why the term appears in almost all the cases where Chrysostom deals with passages in Romans that seem to be empathetic of the divine aspect in human salvation and transformation.

Thus, in commenting on Romans 1.11, he says: "When you hear of grace (and gift, *χάρισμα*) think not that the reward of deliberate choice (*προαιρέσεως μισθός*) on our part, is thereby cast aside; for Paul speaks of grace, not to disparage the labor of *προαίρεσις*, but to cut off the haughtiness which comes from an insolent spirit (*τὸν ἐξ ἀνομοίας ἀποτεμνόμενος τυφόν*). Do not, therefore, fall back (*ἀναπέσης*) because Paul has called this a gift (*χάρισμα*). For he uses, out of plenty of gratitude, to call gifts even our achievements (*κατορθώματα*), because even in these we need a good deal of assistance from above (*πολλῆς ἡμᾶς δεῖσθαι τῆς ἄνωθεν βοήθειας*)."<sup>12</sup>

In another instance, when interpreting the crucial passage Romans 1.18-25, Chrysostom, in order to underline the decisive importance of *προαίρεσις*, brings in the example of Daniel from the Old Testament. Daniel was able to withstand the attack of the lions. "We also are attacked by lions, says Chrysostom, in the form of anger and desires of passions, with fearful teeth tearing asunder those who fall among them. Become then like Daniel and let not these passions plant (*ἐμπηξαι*) their teeth into your soul. But Daniel, you will object, had the whole of grace (*τῆς χάριτος τὸ ὅλον*) assisting him. Correct (*καλῶς*); (this happened) because *προαίρεσις* preceded grace (*ταύτης τὰ τῆς προαιρέσεως προηγέσατο*). So that if we be willing to train ourselves to a similar character (*ἐὰν θέλωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοιοῦτους ἑαυτοὺς κατασκευάσαι*), even now the grace is at hand (*πάρεστι καὶ νῦν ἡ χάρις*)."<sup>13</sup>

Within the same context Chyrostom uses another illustration in order to emphasize the importance of *προαίρεσις*. Do not be afraid if you are attacked and insulted he says. "Don't you see what happens to the adamant? It reverberates the blows it receives. But nature, you

<sup>12</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 2; PG 60.404.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. Homily 3; PG 60.416.

will say, gives it this property. Yes! But, it is in your power to become through προαίρεσις what adamant has by nature (καὶ σοὶ δυνατὸν ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει γενέσθαι τοιοῦτον, ὅπερ ἀπὸ φύσεως ἐκείνῳ συμβαίνει).<sup>14</sup>

Chrysostom's emphasis on προαίρεσις is immediately discernable in his exegesis of the difficult chapter 7 of the Epistle to the Romans. In commenting on Romans 7.19-20, he says: "Do you see how he (i.e. Paul) acquits the essence of the soul (τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς) as well as the essence of the flesh (τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς σαρκός) from accusation, and charges everything to the wicked action (τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τὴν πονηρὰν πράξιν μετέστησε)? . . . Now the essence of the soul and body and of προαίρεσις are not the same. Soul and body are God's works whereas προαίρεσις is a motion from ourselves (ἐξ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν γινομένη κίνησις) towards whatever we want to lead it (πρὸς ὅπερ ἂν αὐτὴν βουληθῶμεν ἀγαγεῖν). For willing (βούλησις) is indeed natural (ἐμφυτον), and is from God; but willing such as this (i.e. προαίρεσις) is our own and from our own mind (ἡμέτερον καὶ τῆς γνώμης ἡμῶν)."<sup>15</sup>

When interpreting Romans 8, the famous chapter on the Spirit, Chrysostom misses no opportunity to underline the significance of προαίρεσις. When, for instance, he speaks about the meaning of the phrase "to walk according to the Spirit" (Rom 8.7-10) he explains: "The gift (of the Spirit) was not put into us by natural necessity (ἀνάγκη φύσεως), but the freedom of choice (ἐλευθερία προαιρέσεως) placed it in our hands. It rests with you, therefore, to become this or that (i.e. to walk according to the Spirit or to walk according to the flesh)."<sup>16</sup>

Chrysostom's eagerness to preserve the idea of the free choice or προαίρεσις intact, surfaces further down at any crucial passage when there appears a danger of misunderstanding. Thus he notes on the occasion of Romans 9.20 ("Will what is molded say to its molder, why have you made me thus?"): "Here Paul says what he says, not to do away with free will (οὐ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἀναιρῶν), but to show up to what point we ought to obey God."<sup>17</sup> And then he comments on Romans 9.22-23: "Whence they are some vessels of wrath and some vessels of mercy? Of their own free choice (ἀπὸ προαιρέσεως οὐκείας)."<sup>18</sup> And "it is not on the potter that the honor and the

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. Homily 3; PG 60.416.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid. Homily 13; PG 60.510.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. Homily 13; PG 60.517.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. Homily 16; PG 60.559.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid. Homily 16; PG 60.561.

dishonor of the things made of the lump depends, but on the use made by those that handle them (ἀπὸ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν μεταχειριζομένων), so here also it depends on the free choice (ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀπὸ τῆς προαιρέσεως).<sup>19</sup>

On the occasion of Romans 11.24, Chrysostom characteristically observes: "When you hear the expression 'contrary to nature' (παρὰ φύσιν), do not suppose that Paul means this nature which is unchangeable (τὴν ἀκίνητον ταύτην φύσιν) . . . For the good things and the bad are not such by nature, but by opinion and deliberate choice alone (γνώμης καὶ προαιρέσεως μόνης)."<sup>20</sup>

### *Faith*

Faith is for Chrysostom a major, indispensable factor in the process of human salvation and transformation, and he makes it abundantly clear in his Roman exegesis. Paul, he argues, has shown in the first three chapters of Romans that the world has become guilty before God, that all had sinned, that boasting was excluded, and that "it was impossible to be saved otherwise than by faith (οὐκ ἔνι σωθῆναι ἑτέρως ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ πίστεως)."<sup>21</sup> But what is exactly the faith he is talking about?

For Chrysostom, faith is a unique human contribution to salvation and change, a phenomenon of huge proportions. In his exegesis of Rom 3.21-22 ("But now the righteousness of God has been manifested . . . the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ"), he states: "In order that no one should say, how can we be saved without ourselves contributing anything, Paul demonstrates that we contribute indeed no small matter toward this (οὐ μικρὸν εἰς τοῦτο), I mean faith."<sup>22</sup> And again, in the case of Rom 5.21 he comments: "See how in all instances God presents both what he does and what we do! On God's part, however, there be things varied and numerous and diverse . . . What we contribute, is only faith (τὴν πίστιν εἰσηγήκαμεν μόνον)."<sup>23</sup>

Such faith is a great contribution indeed. Paul, argues Chrysostom, demonstrates in Romans 4 that the one who believes (πιστεύων) does

<sup>19</sup>Ibid. Homily 16; PG 60.560.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid. Homily 19; PG 60.591.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.453.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid. Homily 7; PG 60.443.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid. Homily 9; PG 60.468.

much more than the one who works (ἐργαζόμενος), and that the one who believes needs much more power (πλείονος δυνάμεως) and abundant strength (πολλῆς τῆς ἰσχύος), and sustains no common degree of labor (οὐ τὸν τυχόντα ὑπομένοντα πόνον).<sup>24</sup>

In order to illustrate this point, and make it absolutely persuasive, Chrysostom speaks extensively about Abraham, the central figure in Romans 4. He shows that Abraham's faith was an expression of "a very brave soul" (γενναϊοτάτης ψυχῆς), of a "wise reasoning" (φιλοσόφου γνῶνης), and of "a lofty mind" (ὕψηλῆς διανοίας). "For to abstain from stealing and murdering is a trifling thing (τῶν τυχόντων ἐστὶ); but to believe that it is possible for God to do things impossible (πιστεῦσαι ὅτι τὰ ἀδύνατα δύνανται Θεός) (as in the case of Abraham), requires a soul of noble nature (μεγαλοφυοῦς τινος δεῖται ψυχῆς), a soul exceedingly affected towards him (σφόδρα περὶ αὐτὸν διακειμένης)."<sup>25</sup>

It is obvious that Chrysostom interprets Romans 4 in a way that shows faith not as an easy religious inclination, nor as a phenomenon indicative of passivity, laziness, weakness or intellectual inertia. On the contrary, he portrays faith as an expression of tremendous power, utter wisdom and nobility of soul, shining in the "belief that it is possible for God to do things impossible."<sup>26</sup> Such a faith can transform the human beings and make them persons of the highest spiritual, mental, and moral quality. Paul, according to Chrysostom, is the best example and evidence for this case. For it was through faith, argues Chrysostom, that "Paul became a great man, although he was of the same human nature as we are (τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν). But faith made him a totally different person (ἡ πίστις αὐτὸν ἄλλον ἀντ' ἄλλου πεποίηκεν)."<sup>27</sup>

Chrysostom will then draw his conclusion about the nobility and genius of faith versus the worthlessness and foolishness of unbelief, and about their diametrically opposite direction of transforming power: "It is then a sign of a weak, little, and pitiful mind not to believe (ἀσθενοῦς διανοίας τὸ μὴ πιστεῦειν, καὶ μωρᾶς καὶ ταλαιπώρου). And so, when some people make faith a charge against us, let us make unbelief (ἀπιστίαν) a charge against them in return, as pitiful (ταλαιπώροις), and little-minded (μικροφύχοις) and foolish and weak,

<sup>24</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.461.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.455.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.455.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.463.

and no better than asses (ὄνων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον διακειμένοις). For as believing belongs to a soul lofty and of noble nature (τὸ πιστεύειν, ὑψηλῆς καὶ μεγαλοφυοῦς ψυχῆς), so unbelieving belongs to a most unreasonable and worthless soul (ἄλογωτάτης καὶ εὐτελοῦς); a soul pulled down to the level of the senselessness of the beasts (πρὸς τὴν κτηνῶν ἄνοιαν κατενηνεγμένης).<sup>28</sup>

It is evident that for Chrysostom faith as depicted in Romans, is a noble and exceedingly important human attribute, which is a decisive agent in the process of salvation and human transformation. The best example of it, as we have seen, is Paul the Apostle who at the same time becomes an expression of the transformed human status. Chrysostom, however, would not allow any misinterpretations about the essence of faith. In many instances he would show that there is a divine dimension in faith, a component that transcends ἄνθρωπος. In a classical passage, Chrysostom offers an eloquent formulation: In Rom 3.27-31, Paul speaks about the law of faith (νόμος πίστεως). "What is this law of faith (τίς δὲ ὁ τῆς πίστεως νόμος)," asks Chrysostom. "To be saved through grace (διὰ χάριτος σώζεσθαι)."<sup>29</sup> The essence of faith, as the highest and ultimate human contribution to the mystery of salvation and transformation, is the declaration that such a salvation and transformation is the exclusive work of the grace of God.

### *Love*

One of the most important interpretative keys in our effort to understand the Epistle to the Romans, according to Chrysostom, is love. He sees it everywhere in the epistle, he detects it in the large as well as in the small pericopes, he finds it both in the theoretical-dogmatic sections and in the practical-ethical ones. He makes it the theme of many of his epilogues to the 32 homilies, and the focus of his parenetic and pastoral digressions.

Chrysostom in his Romans exegesis speaks about all aspects of love, and he always speaks with a burning passion. Here, however, we are particularly interested in the way in which he views love as a drastic agent or expression of human transformation in Christ.

Already in his homily 1 on the opening verses of the Epistle to the Romans, he offers this revealing comment: Paul, in Rom 1.7, "did

<sup>28</sup>Ibid. Homily 8; PG 60.462.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid. Homily 7; PG 60.446.

not simply write 'to all in Rome' (πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ρώμῃ), but with a definition added 'to all God's beloved' (ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ). Why? Because this is the best distinction (ἀρίστη διάκρισις) which shows where from the sanctification comes. Whence then is the sanctification? From love (ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης). This is why after having said 'beloved,' he added 'called to be saints' (κλητοῖς ἁγίοις).<sup>30</sup> This comment is indicative of Chrysostom's understanding of love as a powerful agent for human transformation. Hence he is not tired of pleading with his listeners for love, love for God and Christ: "Let us then so love him (φιλήσωμεν αὐτόν) as we ought to love him. For this is the great reward, this is kingship and pleasure, this is enjoyment and glory and honor, this is light, this is the myriad of bliss (μυριομαχαριότης),<sup>31</sup> which language cannot describe nor mind conceive."<sup>32</sup>

In another instance he adds: "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him (Rom 8.28) . . . For should even tribulation, or poverty, or imprisonments, or famines, or deaths or anything else whatsoever come upon us, God has the power (δυνατός ὁ Θεός) to change all these things into the opposite . . . For one needs only one thing, a genuine love for God (ἐνὸς γὰρ δεῖ μόνου, τοῦ γνησίως αὐτὸν ἀγαπᾶν), and all things follow that."<sup>33</sup>

For Chrysostom the superb model for such a genuine and transforming love for Christ is again, as in the case of faith, Paul. He finds the passage Rom 8.35-39 ("Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?") extremely revealing. In this passage, Paul says that all possible and impossible things and beings, present and future, like "death and life . . . angels and archangels and all heavenly creatures, are small compared to the love for Christ." Paul speaks that way, observes Chrysostom, not in order to belittle the angels and heavenly powers but in order to show quite to the utmost (μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς ἀπάσης) the strong affectionate love (φίλτρον) he had toward Christ. "For he loved Christ not for the things of Christ, but for his sake he loved the things that were his,<sup>34</sup> and to him alone he looked, and one thing

<sup>30</sup>Ibid. Homily 1; PG 60.399.

<sup>31</sup>Μυριομαχαριότης seems to be a neologism introduced by Chrysostom. This is a composite word (μυριάς and μαχαριότης, i.e., myriad and bliss) that shows his profound understanding of love.

<sup>32</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 5; PG 60.431.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid. Homily 15; PG 60.540-41.

<sup>34</sup>This is a remarkable formulation: Οὐ γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐφίλει διὰ τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸν τὰ ἐκείνου.



he feared, and that was falling from his love for him.”<sup>35</sup> In the next homily Chrysostom further remarks: “For even being loved by Christ was not the only thing Paul cared for, but loving him exceedingly also (ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σφόδρα φιλεῖν αὐτόν). And this last he cared for most. For he kept one aim in view in all circumstances, the fulfilling of this excellent love (τὸν καλὸν τοῦτον ἐμπλῆσαι ἔρωτα).”<sup>36</sup>

It is interesting to note that in the last mentioned passages, Chrysostom does not use the terms ἀγάπη, ἀγαπῶ, but the terms ἔρωσ and the more intensive verbs φιλῶ or ἐρῶμαι. This is a very strong terminology which is indicative of an intense and intimate relationship and of a total involvement. In the epilogue of homily 9, Chrysostom offers perhaps the best specimen of this kind of exceedingly powerful language:

“There is nothing, absolutely nothing (οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδέν) which the vehement desire (πόθος)<sup>37</sup> cannot defeat, all the more when the desire is even that of God (Θεοῦ πόθος) . . . The person who has such a love (τοιούτον κεκτημένος τὸν ἔρωτα) . . . will fly toward heaven . . . seeing nothing else neither heaven, nor earth, nor sea, but gazing only at the one beauty (πρὸς ἓν μόνον κάλλος τεταμένος) of that glory . . . Let us then fall in love with this love (ἐρασθῶμεν τοῦτον τὸν ἔρωτα), for there is nothing equal to it, both for the sake of things present and for the sake of things to come. Or rather, more than for these, for the nature of the love itself (μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τούτων, δι’ αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ ἔρωτος φύσιν) . . . For greater than anything else is to have Christ, our beloved at once and our lover (τὸν Χριστὸν ἐρώμενον ἔχειν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐραστήν). . . . That then we may by experience come to know (ἵνα οὖν διὰ τῆς πείρας μάθωμεν) what is this spiritual delight (πνευματικὴ εὐφροσύνη), and blessed life (μακάριος βίος), and treasure of a myriad of good things, let us leave everything and cling to that love with a view both to our own joy and to the glory of the intensely desired God (τοῦ ποθομένου Θεοῦ).”<sup>38</sup>

What is particular in Chrysostom’s exegesis of Romans, is this emphasis on a consuming, vibrant and total love which in turn becomes a central anthropological concept. A love leading to a transformation

<sup>35</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 15; PG. 60.546.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid. Homily 16; PG 60.552.

<sup>37</sup>Here Chrysostom uses the word πόθος (desire) as a synonym for love (ἔρωσ), as the context clearly suggests.

<sup>38</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 9; PG 60.474.

of the human being and, at the same time, becoming a sign of such a transformation. Here, love seems to be both cause and effect in the process of a radical human change, and Chrysostom appears to make no distinction between the two, perhaps deliberately so.

### *The Basic Change Through Christ*

The transformation of *ἄνθρωπος* is ultimately the work of God in Christ, no matter how important and indispensable the human contribution is. Chrysostom declares this truth at the very beginning of his exegesis, when he interprets the fundamental statement of Paul in Rom 1.16-17. He writes: "Though you might be a Greek (i.e. pagan), even one that has run into every kind of wickedness (*πᾶσαν ἐπελθὼν κακίαν*), though a Scythian, though a barbarian, though a very brute (*αὐτοθηρίον*), though you might be full of irrationality (*πάσης ἀλογίας γέμων*) and burdened with myriads of loads of sins (*μυρία ἁμαρτημάτων ἐπιφερόμενος φορτία*), no sooner have you received the word concerning the cross and been baptized, than you have blotted out all these (*πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐξήλειψας*) . . . It is the righteousness of God that is revealed here, not yours but God's, a righteousness both abundant and easily accessible (*δαφιλῆς καὶ εὐκολος*). For you do not achieve it by toils and labors (*ἐξ ἰδρώτων καὶ πόνων*), but you receive it by a gift from above (*ἀπὸ τῆς ἁνωθεν δωρεᾶς*) contributing one thing only from your own, namely, 'believing' (*τὸ πιστεῦσαι*)."<sup>39</sup>

There is no doubt that here Chrysostom sees salvation in Christ as a radical transformation of *ἄνθρωπος* wrought by the grace of God. The significant element in this case is the idea of a substantive change, of an existential transformation.

Chrysostom returns to this idea in various instances throughout his Romans interpretation. Before Christ, he asserts in his exegesis of Rom 8.3, humankind faced insurmountable difficulties in its effort to keep the law of God. "This is the reason why the only begotten Son of God came on earth and did not depart before he had set us free from this difficulty. But what is greater is the way of the victory (*ὁ τρόπος τῆς νίκης*). For Christ did not take another flesh (*ἐτέραν σάρκα*) but this very one beset with troubles (*αὐτὴν ταύτην τὴν καταπονουμένην*) . . . The wonderful thing is that the triumph (against sin) was accomplished with the flesh (*μετὰ σαρκὸς τὸ τρόπαιον ἔσται*). Human flesh which had been defeated a myriad of times by sin (*ἡ*

<sup>39</sup>Ibid. Homily 2; PG 60.408-409.

μυριάκις ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας καταβληθεῖσα), this very same flesh (in the person of Christ) brought about a brilliant victory against sin."<sup>40</sup>

While interpreting Rom 6.14, Chrysostom comments: "Our body, before Christ's incarnation was an easy prey to the assaults of sin (εὐχείρωτον τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ) . . . But because Christ has come, the struggle (for virtue) became, afterwards, more easy. Therefore, we have a major goal (μείζονα σκάμματα)<sup>41</sup> set for us in that the assistance given us is greater."<sup>42</sup> He further elaborates on this idea in his exegesis of Rom 8.9. When Paul writes, argues Chrysostom, that "you are not in the flesh but in the spirit," he does not mean that the Romans were bodiless (ἄσώματοι). He simply means that "Christ has not only extinguished the tyranny of sin, but that he has made even the flesh lighter and more spiritual (τὴν σάρκα κουφοτέραν καὶ πνευματικωτέραν ἐποίησε) not by changing its nature but by giving it wings. For as when fire comes in essential contact (ὁμιλεῖ) with iron, the iron also becomes fire, though abiding in its own nature still (ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ μένων φύσει); thus with those who are believers and have the Spirit, the flesh, henceforth, goes over into that manner of energy (ἡ σὰρξ λοιπὸν πρὸς ἐκείνην μεθίσταται τὴν ἐνέργειαν), and becomes wholly spiritual (ὅλη πνευματικὴ γενομένη), crucified in all parts (σταυρουμένη πάντοθεν) and flying with the same wings as the soul (τῇ ψυχῇ συναναπτερουμένη). Such was the body of him who speaks here (i.e. Paul)."<sup>43</sup>

Along the same lines, Chrysostom adds on the occasion of Rom 8.28: "What is indeed wonderful (τὸ δὴ θαυμαστόν) is that not only are we victorious (against temptations, weaknesses, dangers), but that we are so through the very things that are plotting against us (δι' ὧν ἐπιβουλευόμεθα νικῶμεν). And we are not merely victorious but we are supervictorious (οὐχ ἀπλῶς νικῶμεν, ἀλλ' ὑπερνικῶμεν), that is, we are so with great ease, without toils and labors (μετὰ εὐκολίας ἀπάσης, χωρὶς ἰδρώτων καὶ πόνων)."<sup>44</sup>

What Chrysostom seems to imply in the above instances is that the very human existence is in a different state after the incarnation,

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. Homily 13; PG 60.514.

<sup>41</sup>Σκάμμα literally means the place dug up and sanded on which athletes landed in the long jump or on which wrestlers practiced. The picture here is related to the athletic games. The symbolism intended by Chrysostom is obvious.

<sup>42</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 11; PG 60.487-88.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid. Homily 13; PG 60.518.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. Homily 15; PG 60.545.

crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ. Hence, human transformation becomes something feasible. In addition, he emphasizes that now a drastic new factor has entered the scene, namely, the Holy Spirit. There is no more law condemning, but instead there is the Spirit assisting, he declares.<sup>45</sup> And he asks: "How do we know that God will give us his (eternal) gifts? From the things that he has done for us (ἀπο τῶν γεγενημένων). What things? From the love that he has shown towards us (τῆς ἀγάπης, ἣν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπεδείξατο). In what way (τὶ ποιήσας)? By giving the Holy Spirit (Πνεῦμα ἅγιον δούς),"<sup>46</sup> the very Holy Spirit, "through whom he (i.e. Christ) gave us the sanctification (δι' οὗ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ἔδωκεν)."<sup>47</sup> There is no doubt that the Chrysostomic perspective on human transformation is ultimately and organically related to Christ and his giving us the Holy Spirit.

#### *The Vision of the Transformed State*

As the preceding pages indicate, Chrysostom presents in his exegetical homilies on the Epistle to the Romans a series of ideas and concepts that converge to the same point: the possibility, rather, the reality of human transformation in Christ. In fact, he frequently uses a terminology related to change<sup>48</sup>: "When you hear about the newness of life," he says on the occasion of Rom 6.4, "look for a great change (πολλὴν ζῆτει τὴν ἐναλλαγὴν), for a big transformation (μεγάλην τὴν μεταβολήν)." A transformation in which the old age of sin is replaced by the youth of grace because "the soul of the righteous are youthful and vibrant (νεάζουσι καὶ σφριγῶσι), and are permanently in the very prime of life (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἄνθει τῆς ἡλικίας εἰσι διαπαντός), ever ready for any fight and struggle."<sup>49</sup> The change is in conformity to the image of Christ, adds Chrysostom elsewhere, "because what Christ the only-Begotten one was by nature, this the believers have also become by grace (ὅπερ ὁ Μονογενὴς ἦν φύσει, τοῦτο καὶ αὐτοὶ γεγόνασιν κατὰ χάριν)."<sup>50</sup>

What Chrysostom describes is not a future eschatological condition, but a present situation. He speaks about the believers as having

<sup>45</sup>Ibid. Homily 12; PG 60.499.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid. Homily 9; PG 60.470.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid. Homily 1; PG 60.398.

<sup>48</sup>E.g. ἐναλλαγή, μεταβολή, μεταμόρφωσις, μετάθεσις, μεθίστασθαι, μεταμορφοῦσθαι.

<sup>49</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 10; PG 60.480.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid. Homily 15; PG 60.541.

been already transformed, as having acquired a different status, namely, that of righteousness.<sup>51</sup> He affirms that we cannot say that everything lies in hope, because “we have already reaped fruits (ἤδη σε καρπωσάμενον): first, the being freed from the wickedness and such evils as the very recollection of puts one to shame; second, the being made servants unto righteousness (δουλωθῆναι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ); third, the enjoying of sanctification (τὸ ἁγιασμοῦ ἀπολαῦσαι); fourth, the obtaining of life (τὸ καὶ ζωῆς ἐπιτυχεῖν), and life not temporary but eternal.”<sup>52</sup>

Because of the new transformed state, Chrysostom can urge his listeners to advance the process of changing to its utmost: “Give yourselves totally to virtue (ὅλους ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδοτε τῇ ἀρετῇ), doing nothing at all related to evil (μηδὲν καθόλου τῆς κακίας πράττοντες).”<sup>53</sup> For him, virtue in this context is not a term limited semantically to ethics, but a code term pointing to the new transformed condition in Christ. This is why when he interprets Rom 13.14 (put on the Lord Jesus Christ), he asserts that “everyone who has put on Christ as a garment, has all the absolute virtue (ἅπασαν ἔχει καθόλου τὴν ἀρετήν).”<sup>54</sup> In a classical formulation related to Rom 12.2, Chrysostom further elaborates: “Paul urges us (in Rom 12.2), ‘do not be conformed (συσχηματίζεσθε) to this world but be transformed (μεταμορφοῦσθε) by the renewal of your mind.’ Paul did not say change the shape (μετασχηματίζου) but be transformed (μεταμορφοῦ), showing that the essence of the world is a shape, a fashion (τὸ μὲν τοῦ κόσμου σχῆμα), whereas the essence of virtue is not a shape (τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς οὐ σχῆμα) but a kind of a real and true form (ἀλλὰ μορφή τις ἀληθής).”<sup>55</sup> A form having a natural beauty (φυσικὸν ἔχουσα κάλλος) that does not need the external cosmetics and shapes (ἔξωθεν ἐπιτρίμματα καὶ σχήματα) which, as soon as they appear, they cease to exist (ὁμοῦ τε φαινομένων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων).”<sup>56</sup>

Chrysostom’s perception of the Christians as transformed human

<sup>51</sup>Ibid. Homily 12; PG 60.495: νῦν μετέστητε πρὸς τὴν διακαιουσίνην.

<sup>52</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 12; PG 60.495.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid. Homily 12; PG 60.495.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid. Homily 24; PG 60.624.

<sup>55</sup>Chrysostom here makes a sharp distinction between σχῆμα and μορφή (also between μετασχηματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι). Σχῆμα for him is something external, ephemeral, even superficial, whereas μορφή is something essential, permanent, reflecting the true being.

<sup>56</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 20; PG 60.597-98.

beings is so advanced, as to make him compare them even with angels. He observes on the occasion of Rom 8.9 ("you, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit"): "The spiritual person (πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος) not only does not live anymore in sin, but not even in the flesh, having become from that very moment an angel (ἄγγελος ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη γενόμενος), and ascended into heaven, henceforth, barely carrying the body about (τὸ σῶμα ἀπλῶς περιφέρων)." <sup>57</sup>

Further down, in homily 18, Chrysostom returns to the same idea with a significant elaboration: "The heavens are telling the glory of God . . . But God is not so much revered because of the heavens as of a pure, holy life. When, then, we are discussing with Gentiles we do not cite the heavens but the human beings, who were worse than the beasts and God made them the angels' competitors (ἐφαιμίλλους ἀγγέλοις). For ἄνθρωπος is far better than the heavens (πολὺ βελτίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἄνθρωπος) and he can acquire a soul far brighter and beautiful than the beauty of the heavens. Do you want an example? . . . The heavens being contemplated for so long have not convinced many to return to God. Paul, on the other hand, preaching the Gospel for a limited time, attracted to God the whole world (οἰκουμένη) because he had a soul far superior to heavens; a soul able to draw the people to God. The loftiness of his soul surpassed all heavens (ἄπαντας ὑπερέβη τοὺς οὐρανοὺς), and conversed with Christ himself. And its beauty was such that even God proclaimed it (ὡς καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀνακηρύττειν αὐτὸ τὸ κάλλος)." For when the stars were created, they were admired by the angels; but Paul was admired by God himself!" <sup>58</sup>

The person and the example of Paul the Apostle are central in Chrysostom's understanding of the Epistle to the Romans and in his passionate insistence on the amazing perspectives for human transformation in Christ. Chrysostom was able, through his brilliant exegesis on Romans, to present vital and decisive aspects of the radical changes that occur to any human being entering the realm of true faith in Christ and communion with him. As we have seen in this paper, basic concepts like *προαίρεσις*, faith, love, and grace have been ingeniously and insightfully reinterpreted and presented as basic factors or substantive expressions in the process of human transformation. To be sure, Chrysostom was able to produce such an anthropologically

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. Homily 13; PG 60.518.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid. Homily 18; PG 60.580.

refreshing exegesis by totally immersing himself into the text of Romans, by reading it thoroughly and carefully, and by analyzing it and researching it tirelessly. Chrysostom's achievement, however, is even more the result of his constant focusing not only on the text but also on the author of the Epistle to the Romans. It is extremely significant that he is incessantly conversing with Paul, that he is raising him at every step of exegesis as the superb example of human transformation in Christ, and that he is talking about him as the ultimate and definitive evidence for such a transformation, as the finest human image of true existential change.

This attitude and stance of Chrysostom explains why he closes his exegetical homilies on Romans with a personal, extensive, and passionate reference to Paul. In his last homily, in the very final paragraphs, he visualizes Paul lying in his tomb, somewhere in Rome, the city where his great epistle was sent. And he bursts out in the following moving way:

"I wish I could see the dust of Paul's hands, hands in chains,<sup>59</sup> through the imposition of which the Spirit was given, through which this divine letter (to the Romans) was written . . .

I wish I could see the dust of those eyes which were rightly blinded and recovered their sight again for the salvation of the world; which were counted worthy to see Christ in the body; which saw earthly things, yet saw them not; which saw the things that are not seen; which knew no sleep, and were watchful even at midnight . . .

I wish I could also see the dust of those feet, Paul's feet, which run through the world and were not tired, which were bound in stocks when the prison shook, which went through parts populated and uninhabited, which walked on so many journeys . . .

I wish I could see the tomb, where the weapons of righteousness lay, the weapons of light, the limbs of Paul, which now are alive but in life were made dead (to sin) . . . which were Christ's limbs, clothed in Christ . . . bound in the Spirit, riveted to the fear of God, bearing the marks of Christ.

Who could grant me this gift, to throw myself around (*περιχυθῆναι*) the body of Paul, and be riveted to his tomb, and to see the dust of that body which completed what was lacking in Christ's afflictions;

<sup>59</sup>The phrase "hands that were in chain" is an allusion to Eph 6.20. In the lines that follow in the Chrysostomic text the reader could easily recognize plenty of allusions to or verbatim citations of passages from the Pauline epistles.

which bore the marks (of Christ) and sowed the Gospel everywhere . . . the dust of that mouth through which Christ spoke . . . Nor is it that mouth only, but I wish I could see the dust of Paul's heart too, which one should rightly call the heart of the world (*καρδία τῆς οἰκουμένης*), the fountain of countless blessings, and the very element of our life . . . A heart which was so large as to take in entire cities, and peoples, and nations . . . Which loved Christ like no one else ever did . . . Which became higher than the heavens, wider than the whole world, brighter than the sun's beam, warmer than the fire, stronger than the adamant."<sup>60</sup>

Having said that, Chrysostom turns to his listeners-readers and offers his final plea for a life in pursuit of transformation in Christ following Paul's example:

"Let us then, laying all this to heart, stand nobly and bravely (*γενναίως*); for Paul was also a human being, partaking of the same nature with us, and having everything else in common with us. But because he showed such great love for Christ, he went up above the heavens and stood with the angels. And so if we too would rouse ourselves up a little and kindle in ourselves that fire, we shall be able to emulate that holy man. For if this was impossible, he would never have cried aloud (*ἔβόα*) and said, "be imitators of me as I am of Christ (1 Cor 11.1)." Let us not then admire him only or be amazed with him, but imitate him."<sup>61</sup>

Chrysostom's last word on Romans is an open invitation to a life of transformation in Christ modelled after the author of the Epistle to the Romans, a rejuvenating invitation to a study of redeeming perspectives on human metamorphosis.

<sup>60</sup>Chrysostom, *On Romans*, Homily 32; PG 60.678-80.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid. Homily 32; PG 60.681-82.



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Reviews

---

*Βυζαντινή κληρονομία—Θεολογία, Ίστορία, Παιδεία* [Byzantine Heritage: Theology, History, Education]. By Demetrios J. Constantelos. Athens: "Damaskos" Editions, 1990. Pp. 217. Paper.

The Reverend Doctor Demetrios J. Constantelos, Distinguished Charles Cooper Townsend Professor of History and Religious Studies at Stockton State College in Pomona, New Jersey, is the author of *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare, Poverty, Society, and Philanthropy in the Late Medieval Greek World*, and eight other books, more than fifty articles in Greek and English, and countless reviews. His most recent book, a collection of essays previously published but here revised and translated into Greek, very much reflects the author's views as a Byzantinist deeply respectful of the Classical Greek tradition and the biblically and patristically rooted Byzantine Christian heritage. The book's title does not fully represent the range of the subject matter treated, which, in fact, deals with ancient, mediaeval, and modern contributions and concerns.

Following a brief general introduction, the book is divided into three general parts: (1) "Theoretical Foundation"; (2) "From the Historical Experience of the Christian Complement"; and (3) "Ancient Sources with Contemporary Messages." Part One contains four essays on (1) "Towards a Renewed and Living Church"; (2) "Worship of the 'Word' and 'Form,' Mind and Heart"; (3) "The Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church"; and (4) "Common Signs of Medicine and Religion in the Greek and Orthodox Tradition." Part Two contains five essays on (1) "The Greek Language and the Experience of the Church"; (2) "The Ubiquitous Presence of the Orthodox Clergy"; (3) "Women's Philanthropy in Greek Orthodox Life"; (4) "Old Age in the Greek Orthodox Tradition," and (5) "The

NeoMartyrs—Witnesses of a Living Church.” Part Three contains five essays that deal with (1) “The Greek Christian Cultural Ideal of the Three Hierarchs”; (2) “The Social and Moral Teaching of Basil the Great”; (3) “The Social Teaching of St. Chrysostom”; (4) “Theology and Pastoral Ministry According to Holy Photios”; and (5) “Mysticism and Social Action: Theoleptos of Philadelphia.”

The mere listing of the titles of Father Constantelos’ articles should give the reader some sense of the author’s approach, which can fairly be described as integrated and comprehensive. In all of his efforts, he stresses the interrelatedness and continuity of history and religion, theory and practice, theology and pastoral care. Though the title *Byzantine Heritage* could be viewed as restrictive, the contents are not, and the book might better have been called *The Greek, Christian, and Byzantine Heritage* because it everywhere demonstrates that Orthodox Christianity cannot be fully understood or appreciated without an accurate and proper knowledge of Greek history and culture, the Bible and early Christianity, the Church Fathers, and Byzantine history and culture, with special emphasis on the contemporary manifestations of those elements in church and society in our own days.

Father Constantelos sees the need for the contemporary Church to be self-critical, to be constantly reexamining itself in terms of its mission (“the Church is the conscience of the Gospel”), and in assessing its work. He advocates a return to the enthusiasm of early Christianity and the straightforwardness and clarity of the Church Fathers. In his essay on certain of the Fathers, he clearly shows how they combined an expertise in theology, a deep commitment to the Christian faith, and a concern for the spiritual *and* physical welfare of society. Naturally enough, with his own deep interest in philanthropy and social welfare, Dr. Constantelos everywhere stresses the Church’s concern in these areas and especially brings to life and light the extensive achievements of Byzantium in this regard—achievements much more extensive than is generally acknowledged—and the practical application of the Christian faith to social problems, consistent with the Gospel’s injunctions of Christian love. God’s love for man, he would point out, must be carried out in each human being’s love for every other human being. In this respect, Professor Constantelos’ essays on the closeness of the medical profession and the priesthood in early Christianity and the Byzantine period are especially appropriate (the well-being of human beings is common to both) as is

the long tradition from antiquity to the present of women's philanthropy (which the author surveys from the *Odyssey* to the contemporary work of the Philoptochos societies in the Orthodox Church). The same is done for the long history of concern for the elderly from antiquity to the present. Even the relevance of the Greek language for the Greek Orthodox Church is reviewed and realistically assessed.

The essay at the end of the book on the Fathers show that these Church leaders knew and respected Greek learning in terms consistent with Christianity, stressing the importance of *arete*, Holy Scriptures, and faithfulness to the Church's teachings, with the ultimate goal being *theosis*. The Fathers stressed the importance of moral and social justice, the implementation of the Gospel's injunction of love toward God and one another, and that true theology is the implementation of Christian love. Even monasticism and its mystics could not escape the moral obligation for the spiritual and physical care and improvement of human society, in a manner consistent with Biblical, Patristic, and Byzantine traditions and practices.

*Byzantine Heritage* is a book written with Father Constantelos' usual enthusiasm, verve, and absolute clarity. The author has admirable command of primary and secondary sources (each essay is appropriately documented) but, more than that, he sees history and religion as living forces that are vitally present in our own world today and finds the Byzantine Christian experience one that is alive, illuminating, instructive, and conducive to the promotion of a truly Christian life in today's world.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (330-1990): "First Among Equals" in the Eastern Orthodox Church.* By Deno J. Geanakoplos. Second Revised Edition. Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1990. Pp. 28 plus 4 plates. Paper. \$2.95.

Deno J. Geanakoplos, Bradford Durfee Professor Emeritus of Byzantine, Italian Renaissance History and Orthodox Church History of Yale University, is an internationally known scholar who has published thirteen books and more than one hundred articles. *A Short History*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Byzantine Perceptions of the Latin West\*

---

ARISTEIDES PAPADAKIS

IN WHAT IS NOW A CLASSIC SUMMARY STATEMENT OF THE ORIGINS OF the schism written in 1965, the late dean of Byzantine historians, Paul Lemerle, argued that "nothing perhaps is more difficult to write than the true history of the relations between the Churches of the East and the West, and of the progressive collapse of primitive Christian ecumenism."<sup>1</sup> Though rarely cited in the literature, Professor Lemerle's paper was a salutary reminder by a gifted historian of the complexity of this sensitive subject and the deliberate polemical distortions in which its history had been routinely enshrined before the Second World War and the founding of Dumbarton Oaks. Arguably, no area of our discipline has suffered more from an activist western bias than Byzantine religion. As a rule, its history has indeed been "impassioned, falsified, and distorted"<sup>2</sup> by purely confessional considerations and outright malice. Palamism before the 1940s, to cite but one example, was habitually defined either as a grotesque aberration in the body of Byzantine monasticism or as a monstrous combination of mysticism and Messalianism. As one learned Assumptionist father cheerfully claimed (in the name of history and pure scholar-

\* Paper originally presented at a symposium on "Byzantine Civilization in the Light of Contemporary Scholarship," at Dumbarton Oaks, Harvard University Center for Byzantine Studies, May 3-5, 1991.

<sup>1</sup> Paul Lemerle, "L'Orthodoxie byzantine et l'oecuménisme médiéval: les origines du 'schisme' des Églises," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 4th ser., no. 2 (1965) 239: "Rien peut-être n'est plus difficile que d'écrire l'histoire vraie des relations entre les Églises d'Orient et d'Occident, et de la progressive dégradation de l'oecuménisme chrétien primitif."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 239.

ship, of course) "thirty years of incessant controversy and discordant councils ended with a resurrection of polytheism."<sup>3</sup>

Happily, this dismissive assessment of the religious dimensions of Byzantine society, with its zeal for disparagement and disdain, is by and large on the wane. Actually, in the fifty years that have elapsed since the establishment of Dumbarton Oaks scholarly assessment of Byzantine theology, history, and spirituality has changed significantly. As a matter of plain fact the focus of investigation and interpretation was already evolving even as Lemerle wrote. Francis Dvornik's *The Photian Schism*, John Meyendorff's *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, and Sir Steven Runciman's *The Eastern Schism* — to mention only three magisterial revisionist studies — had already been published.<sup>4</sup> Since then, the change has been in some respects remarkable. We need only to compare Jaroslav Pelikan's recent luminous reinterpretation of patristic theology and its Byzantine disciples with Adolph Harnack's fundamentally misleading position on the same subject to appreciate how far we have moved from the historiographic clichés and acrimonious debates of the past.<sup>5</sup> Numerically, moreover, critical editions of texts have increased decisively. More than a third of the texts published thus far in the new *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* series are directly related to the life of the Byzantine ecumenical patriarchate or to theological controversy and correspondence. Unlike scholars in the seventeenth century, our choice of texts and the questions we ask of them, as Professor Ihor Ševčenko reminded us recently, are no longer determined by the needs of the Catholic religion or

<sup>3</sup> S. Vsilhé, "Greek Church," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1903) 5.752; H. Delehaye, "Byzantine Monasticism," in N. H. Baynes and H. St. L. B. Moss (eds.), *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization* (Oxford, 1949), p. 158; cf. M. Jugie "Palamas Grégoire," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris, 1932) 11/2.1735-1818. This negative attitude towards Palamas was not unique but was applied to other Byzantine theologians, see A. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)* (New York, 1983), pp. 5-11.

<sup>4</sup> F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge, MA, 1948); J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959); English translation: *A Study of Gregory Palamas* (London, 1964); S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford, 1955).

<sup>5</sup> J. Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* vol. 2 of *The Christian Tradition* (Chicago, 1974); A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 3 vols. (Tübingen, 1931-32). Cf. G. F. Chesnut, "A Century of Patristic Studies, 1888-1988," in H. W. Bowden (ed.) *A Century of Church History: The Legacy of Phillip Schaff* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois, 1988), pp. 36-73.

"the French and papal religious policies in the Levant."<sup>6</sup> Finally, as a result of the new orthodoxy in contemporary historiography, urgent appeals have been made to broaden the boundaries of research, by placing the phenomena of religious controversy and doctrinal disagreement within the wider cultural context and social space of the Byzantines. Beneath such phenomena, it has been suggested, "lay not only political rivalry but also — perhaps above all — social and ideological diversity."<sup>7</sup>

This is not to say that western negativism and parochialism have vanished altogether. Multi-volume histories of the Church universal are still being written without any mention of non-western Christendom (whether Greek or Slavic) except perhaps marginally and sporadically. For such partial histories, Christian universality is *de facto* universality of the West. Though this may sound heretical, productivity, too, has not been extensive, even if we are told that the role of the Church is now one of the most studied aspects of Byzantine civilization.<sup>8</sup> Personally, I doubt it. "Without counting items in anyone's list, I am sure that there are more first-rate monographs on the theology of Augustine than on the entire theological history of Byzantium."<sup>9</sup> To put it otherwise, the number of Byzantinists working in historical theology or Church history proper is rather limited, especially in America. Too many still tend to think of Byzantium's theological legacy as an *adiaphoron* to the discipline. It bears

<sup>6</sup> *Association Internationale des Études Byzantines: Bulletin d'Information et de Coördination* 14 (1987-88), p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> A. Kazhdan and G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium: An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, D.C., 1982) 95; see also H.-G. Beck, *Das byzantinische Jahrtausend* (Munich, 1978), pp. 166, 204.

<sup>8</sup> J. M. Hussey, "Gibbon Rewritten: Recent Trends in Byzantine Studies," in A. H. Armstrong and E. J. B. Fry (eds.), *Rediscovering Eastern Christendom* (London, 1963), p. 103; Kazhdan and Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium*, p. 76. The old touchy defensiveness along confessional lines still survives; see its more recent modified manifestation in B. Schultze, "Patriarch Gregorios II. von Cypern über das Filioque," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 51 (1985) 163-87; and *Istina* 19 (1974) 257-349 (articles on Palamite theology). The lack of a more balanced approach in histories of the Church is being rectified by the new series, *The Church in History*; only one volume — the second in a projected series of six — has appeared: J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450-680 A.D.* (New York, 1989). H.-G. Beck, *Geschichte der orthodoxen Kirche im byzantinischen Reich* (Göttingen, 1980) and J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1986) are important additions to the scholarly literature but still limited in scope and viewpoint.

<sup>9</sup> Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, p. viii.



repeating, too, that the teaching of New Testament and patristic Greek, Russian and Church Slavonic in American universities and divinity schools, has not produced, as we should expect, a corresponding growth in research and writing on Eastern Church history.<sup>10</sup>

I am of course speaking broadly and do not mean to obscure or deny the achievements of more recent scholarship. The hardening of confessional differences, of which Professor Lemerle spoke, has been studied in detail, and it is here, perhaps, that progress is more evident. It has at any rate become a commonplace of late Byzantine studies to emphasize the progressive nature of Christian division. The finality of 1054 is correctly viewed as a myth or as an event of no great weight.<sup>11</sup> In the final analysis, the schism cannot be confined to a single incident or precise date. In effect, it is now widely recognized that its causes were already implicitly evident in the age of the ecumenical councils and in the gradual cultural and political polarization that inevitably followed the transfer of the capital to Constantinople, the Germanic migrations, and Arabic invasions. That these events, together with the later Norman incursions, the post-Gregorian papacy, and the Latin conquest, affected the organic unity of the Church is beyond doubt. Indeed, in attempting to explain the breakdown of Christian solidarity, no serious reader of the evidence can deny the psychological impact and popular outrage unleashed by these movements. This is particularly true of the fourth crusade (1204), when Byzantine xenophobia, anti-Latin sentiment, and hostility, were to reach new heights.<sup>12</sup> Predictably, the old fraternal rivalry between the Churches is today seen almost exclusively as a political problem, a problem of history rather than a problem of faith. Although the religious disputes are not denied, they are, nonetheless, viewed as purely peripheral and, therefore, unimportant. The canonical,

<sup>10</sup>See J. Pelikan in Bowden, *A Century of Church History*, pp. x-xi (Foreword).

<sup>11</sup>For the documentation for the incident of 1054, see C. Will, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saec. XI composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861); see also A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios: Quellen und Studien zum Schisma des XI Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1924-30).

<sup>12</sup>See J. Darrouzès, "Le mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins," *Revue des études byzantines* 21 (1963) 50-100, who concludes that after the shattering effect of the fourth crusade the inclination was "à noyer les questions essentielles dans l'accumulation des détails qui tournent à la caricature et au pamphlet." Cf. N. Oikonomidès, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (13ème-15ème siècles)* (Montreal and Paris, 1979), pp. 23-33 (chapter on Byzantine anti-Latin ideology).

liturgical, theological, or ecclesiological issues, were not as such the root cause of the schism. On the contrary, the real differences separating the two parties were in all essential respects unrelated to faith and dogma.<sup>13</sup>

Overall, this contemporary treatment of the problem is essentially sound. The non-theological factors, to say it once more, are undeniable. That they helped stoke the fires of bigotry and intolerance is obvious; they evidently did little to defuse or reduce the existing adversarial tension. On the other hand, the unambiguous emphasis routinely placed on these factors by historians is distorting.<sup>14</sup> As it happens, there is no evidence that either side deemed reconciliation impossible solely because of such factors, even after the forced latinization of the Byzantine Church and the partition of the empire in 1204. It is indeed possible to argue that these factors would not have led ineluctably to schism had they not been strengthened and intensified by compelling *doctrinal differences*. To be short, both the theological and the historical factors were important; to an unusual degree both were effectively intertwined. Emphasizing one at the expense of the other is pointless and misleading.<sup>15</sup> But the prominence given to the political explanation is problematic for yet another reason. It disposes all too arbitrarily and impatiently, in my view, Byzantium's own developing perception of the Latin West on the theological plane. In effect it makes short shrift of the Byzantines' remarkable ecclesiological and theological intuition. Orthodox tradition is in this respect fundamentally distinct from Western Christendom. This is a prominent part of the historical record and should not be minimized. No doubt we are familiar with the virtuosity displayed by the Byzantines in inflated rhetoric and opaque prose. Churchmen were in this regard no exception. Still, the surviving theological literature is also as a rule notable for its critical scrutiny of ecclesiastical history and

<sup>13</sup>P. Lemerle, "Byzance et la Croisade," *X. Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche*, 3 (Florence, 1955) 617: "The schism had not yet separated the two Christian worlds; it is, on the contrary, *because of 1204* and that which followed that the schism took on importance and significance." Also Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* 145; J. Gill, *History of the Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959) 13; cf. however, G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford, 1968), p. 337.

<sup>14</sup>Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, 170: "While the East-West schism stemmed largely from political and ecclesiastical discord, this discord also reflected basic theological differences, whose importance must be neither exaggerated (as it was by the antagonists) nor minimized (as it has been by modern historians)."

<sup>15</sup>J. Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church* (London, 1962), p. 41.

for its reliability. Actually, "it is extraordinary to discover how precise, responsible, and accurate the Byzantines were when they theologized about issues of faith or ecclesiology."<sup>16</sup> Briefly put, allowing the political causes to obscure the authentic underlying doctrinal or ecclesial implications of the schism may be a reductionist approach to the problem. It would be false and misleading, at any rate, to imply that the Byzantine Church had no legitimate theological justification for its stiff opposition to Rome's radical tampering with established doctrine, with Church government or Church order.

Although in the long and uneven East-West quarrel the mutual anathemas of 1054 must be viewed, to repeat, as a minor episode, there can be no doubt that the eleventh century was itself a divide. It was then that a new German-oriented papacy began to transform its ancient titular primacy into direct jurisdictional power — into primatial despotism and centralism. An ecclesiological dichotomy was in a genuine sense emerging, as the Gregorian papacy began to interpret the role and nature of authority in the Church along absolute lines. Equally, it was also in this period that the age-old divisive issue of the *Filioque* was invested with a new dimension. The altered text of the Creed, which was by then widespread in most of Western Christendom was finally accepted by the papacy as well for the first time (1014). Significantly, although this unauthorized modification of an ecumenical document was essentially a doctrinal issue, it soon became inseparably attached in the East to the problem of ecclesiology as well. Specifically, Eastern Christendom was before long asking of the West (with some embarrassment and surprise, it is worth adding) by what authority the pope was empowered to alter unilaterally such a text previously endorsed by Church councils. Did the faith in fact depend on such councils or was it ultimately subject to a legally defined institution such as the newly reformed papacy?

It is perhaps superfluous at this point to linger on what is obvious or well known. The so-called Petrine proof-texts or *Primatworte*, on which medieval apologists of both sides focused their polemic, have been studied with authority many times.<sup>17</sup> It is necessary only

<sup>16</sup>J. Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood, NY, 1982), p. 250.

<sup>17</sup>See K. Froehlich, "Saint Peter, papal primacy and the exegetical tradition 1150-1300," in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities 1150-1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 3-44; J. Meyendorff et al., *The Primacy of Peter* (London 1963); J. Ludwig, *Die Primatworte Matth. 16,18.19 in der altkirchlichen Exegese*

to observe that Byzantine exegesis was tied directly to the Orthodox ecclesiological model, to Byzantium's essentially pluralistic understanding of church structure. Quite simply, for the Christian East, Saint Peter's succession was never confined territorially to the Roman see and the pope alone, but was possessed equally by each local Church or community in its bishop. In other words, despite Rome's uncontested traditional *presveia* and honorary pride of place among the primatial sees, the pope's jurisdiction was in the end essentially "Latin" or regional in character rather than universal. It went without saying that if decisions affecting the Church as a whole had to be made, they had to be reached by agreement of the entire episcopal ministry meeting normally in a joint council. Truth did not depend as such upon the overriding infallible authority of an institution or an individual pontiff. The supreme organ of ecclesial authority, by means of which the episcopate declared its consensus on issues of common concern, was the council. As a result, in the East both Peter's *exclusive* succession in Rome and the pope's claims to be the *ultimate* criterion in matters of faith, failed to pass muster. Significantly, both of these items were deemed indefensible for lacking not only biblical but historical authority. As far as the Byzantines were concerned, the theory of papal power (to paraphrase Oscar Wilde's famous remark on the English peerage) was the best thing in fiction the Latins had ever done. To put it otherwise, whereas papal apologists usually took comfort in the fact that behind Gregorian ideology lay a homogeneous development stretching back to the early history of the Church, Byzantine polemicists insisted that the development was actually a myth, a deliberate distortion of both historical reality and Christian tradition.<sup>18</sup>

Needless to say, the new ecclesiology embraced by the reactivated papacy of the eleventh century was fundamentally different from the one known to the East since antiquity. For Byzantine churchmen, like the twelfth century Niketas of Nicomedia, nothing was perhaps more obvious. Poking fun at the papacy's peculiar reading of Church structure and history, Niketas was to ask the Gregorian Anselm of Havelberg (then on an embassy to Constantinople): "Why do we need

---

(Münster, 1952).

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Lemerle, "L'Orthodoxie byzantine et l'oecuménisme médiéval," 246: "Quand on examine laquelle des deux Églises s'y trouve plus proche du christianisme primitif, on constate que c'est généralement l'orthodoxie."

a knowledge of the Scriptures or a study of literature or the doctrinal discipline of the masters or the noblest achievements of the wise Greeks? All by itself the authority of the Roman pontiff nullifies all of these. . . . Let him alone be bishop, master, and preceptor, let him alone, as the only good shepherd, be responsible to God for everything that has been committed to him."<sup>19</sup> Niketas' near-contemporary, Theophylact of Ochrid, was no less on target concerning the pope's legislative functions. As he sarcastically stressed to one of his correspondents, he was unwilling to accept any teaching as true just because it is proclaimed by the authority of the Roman pontiff, even if the Latins "shake the keys of the kingdom in our faces."<sup>20</sup> Sharply critical remarks as these could perhaps be construed as deliberate obstinacy, were it not for the fact that both authors just cited are exceptionally eloquent examples of intellectual openness and tolerance. Neither was ever contemptuous of the Roman faith and its usage. Unlike some of his more zealous contemporaries, for example, the archbishop of Bulgaria, was altogether unconvinced that trivial liturgical or disciplinary divergences were a cause of schism. Slandering the legitimate customs of the Western Church, he wrote, was possible only when one ignores church history. "Christian unity is threatened only by those practices which have a doctrinal implication."<sup>21</sup>

Clearly, not all Byzantines were critically scornful and uncharitable towards the Latin faith. No less obvious is the fact that they were seldom inarticulate or tongue-tied, even if they were often puzzled by western ecclesiastical developments. Their message as a rule comes through loud and clear. To put it otherwise, although the wearisome medieval tug of war involving the two sister Churches often leaves

<sup>19</sup>*Anselmi Havelbergensis Dialogi*, PL 188.1219; for an analysis of Anselm's debate with Niketas, see N. Russell, "Anselm of Havelberg and the union of the Churches," *Sobornost* 1, no. 2 (1979) 19-41; 2 no. 1 (1980) 29-41; cf. G. R. Evans, "Anselm of Canterbury and Anselm of Havelberg: The Controversy with the Greeks," *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 53 (1977) 158-75.

<sup>20</sup>P. Gautier (ed.), *Théophylacte d'Achrida; Discours, Traités, Poésies* (Thessalonike, 1980), p. 275; text also in PG 126.221-49 (*Liber de iis quorum Latini incusantur*). For a recent illuminating portrait of this broad-minded ecclesiastic, see D. Obolensky, *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 8-82 (here 44).

<sup>21</sup>Gautier, *Théophylacte d'Achrida*, p. 279: ὡς οὐ πᾶν ἔθος ἀποσχίζειν ἐκκλησίας ἰσχύει, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρὸς διαφορὰν ἄγον δόγματος. Cf. the near-identical approach of the twelfth century abbot of Monte Casino, St. Bruno of Segni, *Tractatus de sacrificio azymo*, PL 165.1085: "Nos vero veraciter tenemus, imo firmiter credimus, quia quamvis sint diversi mores ecclesiarum, tamen una est fides quam indissolubiliter unitur capiti suo, id est Christo: et ipse unus, idemque permanet in suo corpore."

the historian in a state of bemused frustration, it does in the end possess a distinct focus. In virtually all their formal and informal discussions and negotiations, the question of authority in the Church often held center stage. This is particularly evident after the dawn of the second millenium, when Christian Byzantium gradually realized that the Roman primacy (understood as a purely juridical authority over the Church) was in fact compromising Christian unity with its rejection of the collegial and conciliar principle of Church structure.<sup>22</sup> Conventional wisdom aside, Orthodox opinion had become aware of Rome's voluntary claims long before the thirteenth century.<sup>23</sup> The Byzantine view of the true nature of the schism was by then well established. Twelfth century documents, at any rate, already point to the "depths of the intellectual alienation"<sup>24</sup> between the two worlds or (to borrow Father Florovsky's preferred phrase) to the disintegration of the common Christian mind.<sup>25</sup> The only difference in the thirteenth century was actually the brutality with which Latin papal sovereignty and ecclesiology were by then proclaimed.

Suffice it to say, an analysis of the numerous efforts at reconciliation after 1200 made by both centers of Christendom is beyond the scope of this brief communication. That these encounters were usually fruitless — peace or agreement was never attained — is well known. All the same, it is legitimate to ask why that was so, particularly since neither side (to say it once more) viewed the *de facto* schism as irreparable. As it happens, the surviving evidence does suggest

<sup>22</sup>See especially, J. H. Erickson, "Collegiality and Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," *Kanon* 4 (1979) 100-12; Y. Congar, *L'Écclésiologie du haut Moyen-Âge* (Paris, 1968), p. 388. For Byzantine authors, one of the texts that best expressed the notion of conciliarity (without rejecting the idea of legitimate primacy) was Apostolic canon 34: "The bishops of every nation must acknowledge him who is first among them and account him as their head, and do nothing of consequence without his consent; but each may do those things which concern his own parish, and the country places which belong to it. But neither let him who is the first do anything without the consent of all. For so there will be oneness of mind, and God will be glorified through the Lord in the Holy Spirit." Not surprising, the canon is cited often as a proof-text. See Nilus Cabasilas, *De primatu papae*, PG 149.728A.

<sup>23</sup>J. Darrouzès, "Les documents byzantines du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle sur la primauté romaine," *Revue des études byzantines* 23 (1965) 42-88; J. Spiteris, *La critica Byzantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Rome, 1979). See also D. M. Nicol, "The Papal Scandal," *Studies in Church History* 13 (1976) 141-68.

<sup>24</sup>Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, p. 170.

<sup>25</sup>G. Florovsky, *Ecumenism I: A Doctrinal Approach*, vol. 13 of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky* (Belmont, MA, 1989), pp. 28-33.

an answer. Characteristically, the Byzantines were to insist that the only way to solve the problem of disunity was through a dialogue in depth in an open general council. In the Byzantine brief, this was the essential precondition for authentic unity. It remained so down to the breakup of the empire, since only genuine debate it was believed, could eliminate the existing differences and mutual misunderstandings.<sup>26</sup> Such a forum would necessarily be a fully representative council of all the episcopate and of all the Churches, each of which would be represented, involved, and consulted, since each possessed in itself equally the fullness of catholicity. Time and again, consensus-conscious Byzantines were to emphasize that this had been the only acceptable means by which in the past the historic Church had restored solidarity and consent within Christendom.<sup>27</sup> As the stormy history of the ecumenical councils confirmed, creedal unity was always revealed and proclaimed in such a manner, namely, by the *conciliar agreement* of the entire episcopate. This was no less true in times when actual schism existed, as the successful union-council of 879-880, which reestablished communion between East and West during Photios' patriarchate, patently illustrated.<sup>28</sup>

In contrast to this realistic approach to ecumenicity, Rome maintained that the differences between itself and Constantinople were non-negotiable. A council called to secure unanimity by debating doctrine, already defined by so many pontiffs, would serve to place not only the true faith in doubt but the ultimate authority of the papacy as well. In place of discussion and negotiation, in other words, Rome demanded surrender. Implied, of course, was acceptance, without

<sup>26</sup>D. M. Nicol, "Byzantine requests for an oecumenical council in the fourteenth century," *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969) 69-95; reprinted in *Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World* (London, 1972); J. Meyendorff, "Projets de concile oecuménique en 1367: Un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14 (1960) 170-77; A. Papadakis, "Ecumenism in the thirteenth century: The Byzantine case," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 27 (1983) 207-17.

<sup>27</sup>Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, pp. 22-29 ("The councils and their achievements"); G. Florovsky, "Antinomies of Christian history: Empire and desert," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 3 (1957) 133-59; J. Meyendorff, "What is an Ecumenical Council?" *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17 (1973) 259-73; reprinted in the author's *Living Tradition* (Crestwood, NY, 1978), pp. 45-62.

<sup>28</sup>J. Meijer, *A Successful Council of Union: A Theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879-880* (Thessalonike, 1975). Significantly, Fr. Dvornik, *Photian Schism*, has shown that this council was recognized as "ecumenical" in the West until the Gregorian reform of the eleventh century.

reservation, of both the doctrinal position and organization of Latin Christendom. The papal response to Byzantine requests for military assistance against the Turkish threat was invariably based on this same formula of intransigence. Unity was to come first before anything else, and then, and only then, would the papacy consider military aid.<sup>29</sup> As we should expect, by the fourteenth century this papal insistence on orchestrating everything came to be viewed by the Eastern Church as the cause of the lingering schism. As the Palamite metropolitan, Nilos Kabasilas, was to suggest, the cause, strictly speaking, had nothing to do with the primacy or the refusal of the Byzantines to take second place after Rome. "We have never quarreled with the Roman Church about primacy, and there is no question here about taking second place. We know the ancient practice of the Church and the decrees of all the fathers, who called the Roman Church the oldest of all the Churches. . . . What, then, is the cause of this disagreement? It is that this controversial question has not been resolved by a communal decision on the part of an ecumenical council, and that it has not been settled on the basis of the ancient practice of the fathers of the Church, but that the Romans have been playing the part of the master in this and have treated the others like obedient schoolboys."<sup>30</sup> The exact same opinion was voiced by the former emperor John Kantakuzenos in 1367 during his discussion with the legate Paul: "What prevents this desire [for union] from being accomplished," he told the legate, "is the fact that never since the schism have you [the Latins] sought its accomplishment in a friendly and fraternal manner. Always you have adopted a magisterial, authoritarian attitude, never allowing that we or anyone else can contest or contradict what the pope has said or may say in the future."<sup>31</sup>

Given the nature of Rome's eastern policy, Byzantium's call for dialogue, suffice it to say, had no chance of being heard. Not until the council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-39) was the papacy actually willing to drop its ultimatum and accept the Orthodox request for a full-dress debate. That this shift in papal strategy was prompted by the western conciliarist movement is almost certain. By then, however, it was much too late. Although the papal concession to Orthodox

<sup>29</sup>J. Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy, 1198-1400* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1979), pp. 112-15, 253, and 220 (for the papal response to a council).

<sup>30</sup>*De causis dissensionum in Ecclesia*, PG 149.685C. Translation in G. Denzler, "Basic ecclesiological structures in the Byzantine empire," *Concilium* 67 (1971) 68-69.

<sup>31</sup>Meyendorff, "Projets de concile oecuménique en 1367," p. 172.



ecclesiology was welcomed in the East, the fact remains that the Byzantine delegation was unprepared and divided. More fundamentally, the spiritual and theological gap was by then too wide to be bridged effectively or decisively. Despite the prolonged discussion, the issues were actually never solved theologically. Then, too, psychologically, political considerations remained paramount. For the most part, coping with the Turkish threat alone did not seem to the Byzantine delegates like an option. Historically, the tragedy of Florence illustrates that under such conditions even a negotiated ecclesiastical union could not automatically guarantee success.

To summarize, the Byzantine perception of the Latin West in its totality was by no means inflexible or unrealistic. Granted blind conservatism and fanaticism are also part of the record. Still, this prejudice should not be confused or equated with the far more responsible and official approach of the Church itself. More to the point, in attempting to explain Byzantium's on-going dialogue with the West and its grasp of the Latin mentality, proper weight should be placed on its religious dimensions. The most synoptic treatment of the evidence in the end demonstrates that the religious differences were often profound. In the deepest theological sense, the two ecclesiological models, on which attention was focused in this paper, were in fact mutually exclusive. To this one reader of the evidence at any rate, the schism cannot be explained *exclusively* as a cultural phenomenon. It is likely that the political or the cultural differences could have been settled with dispatch had both sides of the confessional fence been able to agree on "a common ecclesiological criterion."<sup>32</sup> The basic issue of authority was never viewed as peripheral or beside the point. In a very real sense it was at the root of the matter. "If it could have been resolved, other questions could have become negotiable; until it was resolved, other questions remained hopeless."<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup>J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York, 1974), p. 91.

<sup>33</sup>Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, p. 272.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

**“Cleansers of the Whole Earth”**  
**The Ecological Spirituality of the Armenian Church**

---

VIGEN GUROIAN

AMONG THE STORIES OF MARTYRED CLERGY OF THE TURKISH GENOCIDE of the Armenians there is one told by the Armenian writer Teotig about a Fr. Ashod Avedidian. Fr. Ashod was a priest of a village in the vicinity of the city of Erzeroum in Eastern Turkey. During the deportations, he and 4000 men of the village were separated from the women and children. On the long death march which followed, when no food remained, Fr. Ashod counseled the men to pray in unison, “Lord, have mercy.” And in the only sacramental gesture possible, he led them in taking the “cursed” soil and swallowing it as communion.

Teotig’s story reminds us that there is no human redemption which excludes the earth from which we come and to which we are intimately bound by God’s creative and saving acts. It is a reminder also of the powerful vision of creation and recreation which belongs to the Armenian tradition. If there is reason for being concerned about our total environment, Fr. Ashod and the men of his village revealed it in their last act of thanksgiving and blessing. In their eucharistic behavior, they affirmed a central belief of biblical religion, that the whole of Creation is the subject of God’s redemption.

Not all observers, however, have viewed Christianity in this way. In 1968, the American historian Lynn White, Jr. published an essay entitled “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis,” in the popular journal *Science*. The article sent up a fire storm of controversy. White blamed Christianity outright for our present ecological mess. He argued that the Bible and the Christian tradition raise two quite

opposing categories of existence. There is history, the realm of God's salvation for the human species, and there is nature, a realm of necessity over which humanity is given dominion. This, concluded White, made possible modern science and technological development. But it also provided the warrant for a devastating exploitation of nature by man solely for his own satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

White's thesis soon found its way into much of the secular as well as religious discussion about ecology. I do not want to deny that there have been strong currents within Christianity, especially western Christianity, which have tended to exalt the human being over the rest of nature so as to dangerously devalue nature. Furthermore, the churches generally have failed to act decisively upon the best intuitions and convictions of biblical faith with respect to issues of the environment. But I do not think White's thesis, taken up by so many others, is entirely fair to Christianity either. And it is important also to mention that this criticism of the Christian faith has been thoroughly ignorant of Orthodox theology, including Armenian Christianity.

As a matter of fact, I think that Armenian Christianity has something rather distinct and valuable to say in the contemporary debate about the environment and the questions being raised within the Christian churches about what the Christian's ecological responsibilities are. The Armenian theological tradition expresses a deep appreciation of all of God's creation. The rather modest goal of this essay is simply to point out some of these resources for a responsible ecological outlook within the tradition. I want to carry out this discussion with special reference to several liturgies and rites of the Armenian Church in which there is a particularly rich ecological vision.

### *Ecology and the Priestly Vocation of the Christian*

Christian tradition describes the human being as having been created in the image and likeness of God. The human being is a special creation and possesses an exceptional power over Creation. This power, however, entails a special vocation and responsibility. The human person must mediate God's presence and God's care to the rest of Creation. He must be priest and steward of Creation. The first chapter of Genesis tells the story this way:

Then God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our

<sup>1</sup> Lynn White, Jr., "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," *Science* 155 (1967), pp. 1203-07.

likeness; to rule the fish in the sea, the birds in the heaven, the cattle, and all wild animals on the earth, and all reptiles that crawl upon the earth." So God created man in his own image; in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. God blessed them and said to them, "Be fruitful and increase, fill the earth and subdue it, rule over the fish in the sea, the birds of heaven, and every living thing that moves upon the earth." God also said, "I give you all plants that bear seed; they shall be yours for food. All green plants I give for food to the wild animals, to all the birds of heaven, and to all reptiles on the earth, every living creature. So it was, and God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. Evening came, and morning came, a sixth day" (Gen. 1.26-31 NEB).

But the second chapter of Genesis tells us that something went wrong. Our primal ancestors were attracted to evil. They were drawn to chaos and nothingness, and disrupted the divinely prepared ecosystem in the Garden of Eden. Adam rejected his priestly vocation and responsibility of stewardship. The blessing of fruitfulness and prospering soon turned to curse. This sinful and fallen condition of our race, the only human condition with which we are acquainted, is described vividly in Genesis 3.14-19. There we hear that not only the serpent was "accursed more than all cattle and all wild creatures," but that Adam and Eve, having been expelled from the garden, were henceforth mortally cursed in all their procreative activities and efforts to cultivate the earth for nourishment and provision for living. From "dust you are, and to dust you shall return," wrote the ancient Hebrew author (Gen. 3.19 RSV).

This theme of blessing turned to curse occurs over and again in the Old Testament. "The earth mourns and withers," wrote the author of Isaiah 24.4-6. The text continues:

the world languishes and withers;  
the heavens languish together with the earth.  
The earth lies polluted  
under its inhabitants;  
for they have transgressed the laws,  
violated the statutes,  
broken the everlasting covenant.

Therefore a curse devours the earth,  
and its inhabitants suffer for their guilt;  
therefore, the inhabitants of the earth are scorched,  
and few are left (RSV).

Thus, the Bible understands sin as a cosmic presence, not merely a matter internal to human life. In the New Testament, Saint Paul expresses this when, in his letter to the Romans, he says that "the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now" (Rom. 8.22 RSV). God sought to correct the wayward course of humanity with its ill effects for all his creatures by bestowing a new blessing upon Noah and his sons, saying once again, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth." After the flood, human beings were given permission to eat the flesh of the animals (Gen 9.3). However, this permission does not detract from the value of animal life as it comes from the hand of God. God leaves a command that the blood of the animals must not be consumed along with the flesh. (Gen 9.4). Blood retains its strong symbolism as the God-bestowed life of a living being. Such life must be returned to the earth in a rite of sacrifice and blessing. This is a practice retained in the Armenian tradition in the ritual of the *Madagh*.<sup>2</sup> In the central prayer of this rite we hear the following:

We give thanks to Thee, O Lord God Almighty, Creator of all creatures, who didst fill and adorn the earth with fruitful and appropriate abundance, and didst give it to men for their needs and enjoyment. . . . And now, beneficent and all-merciful Lord, we bend the knees of our hearts before Thee, and pray Thee that out of Thy munificence Thou send down, at this hour, the grace of Thine all-powerful Holy Spirit upon this table, and bless, by thy mercy, this bread and lamb which are before us. It is from Thy bountiful goodness that we are offering this food to Thee, O God. . . . And to all who will be partaking of this grant salvation, and health in their lives, and forgiveness of transgressions.

Armenian Christians do this even as Noah did when the Ark came to rest on Mount Ararat. There Noah built an altar to God, and took

<sup>2</sup>In the Armenian Church there persists a centuries-old practice of making a sacrifice of a lamb as thanksgiving offering to God. The act of making this offering is called *Madagh* which means quite literally "young and tender." While a lamb is the usual offering, other animals are also used.

of every clean animal, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt offerings on the altar" (Gen 8.20 RSV), which pleased the Lord.

But the Flood did not set things entirely right either. The ecological harmony and peace of Genesis 1 was not wholly restored even under God's new covenant with Noah and his family. Thus we hear at the end of the story of Noah that, until a future time when the divine shalom (peace) is fully restored by God, the "fear of you (man) and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every bird of the air, upon everything that creeps on the ground and all the fish of the sea, into your hand they are delivered" (Gen 9.2 RSV). The Bible gives us a realistic assessment of the actual state of conflict between humanity and the non-human creation.

### *Ecology within the Armenian Rites of Blessing*

The Bible's understanding of blessing concerns the bestowal of the divine gift of life and prosperity (e.g. Gen 27.25-30). Human beings who possess the rational and imaginative capacities to respond to God should be moved to offer thanksgiving for God's blessings. Out of gratitude for the life God has bestowed upon them, Christians offer, in return, praise and thanksgiving. They give back to God something by way of sacrifice for all that he has bestowed upon them. That is what the Armenian rite of the blessing of the *Madagh* is about. And, of course, at the very center of Christian existence is the blessing of the eucharistic meal and sacrifice.

It takes only a moment's reflection, however, to realize how alien all of this blessing business is to the culture in which we live. When God is out of mind, there can be little understanding of blessing. Without God, what we have, what gives us life and the capacity to go on living, is all a matter of chance. By chance life started on this planet millions of years ago and by chance, or perhaps by human folly, all life will one day disappear from it.

This view contrasts ever so much with biblical faith. This faith does not permit the kind of fatalism or man-centeredness which runs through modern culture. For the Christian, God is concerned not only with those events specifically having to do with human will and doing, but with all the processes of nature. This whole process is what the Bible and Christian theology have called the Creation. According to the Christian faith, the human person may indeed have a special role in the created order, but human beings are not all that is in God's memory or under God's providence.

The culture, quite expectantly, has produced its own counter-movements which call it back from its man-centeredness and selfishness. But I do not think we can be terribly comfortable with these movements. The so-called deep ecology movement, for example, challenges a godless man-centeredness with the denial of any special place for humanity. This movement champions nature untouched by the human being. In his recent best seller, *The End of Nature*, the author Bill McKibben laments: "We have built a greenhouse, a *human creation*, where once there blossomed a sweet and wild garden."<sup>3</sup> This is not the same garden described in the book of Genesis. In Genesis, as we have seen, Adam is represented as "cultivator," "steward," and "blesser." Christianity knows of no uncultivated garden. All who inhabit the garden benefit from it. The human being has the special vocation of tending the garden and blessing it to its proper use and praise of God. The Christian eucharist establishes a profound connection both in origin and fulfillment between humanity and the entire material Creation. Christian faith looks forward to a time, not when "nature" is "liberated" entirely from human presence, but, as the Armenian hymn of the blessing of the water envisions, the day when "the shut and barred gate of the garden is opened for mankind." This reunion is anticipated not in order to give us permission to continue to abuse Creation. Rather, we are encouraged to look forward to a restoration of the original harmony and peace among all God's creatures and a return of Adam to his priestly vocation and responsible stewardship.

Christians bear a distinctive vision of life and salvation, one which is by its very nature and content ecological. We have already gained a glimpse of this vision in the text from the prayer of blessing in the Armenian rite of the *Madagh*. I want to continue in that course of study by taking a brief journey through some prayers and hymns of several other rites of blessing. I start with the rites of baptism and epiphany. Both these rites celebrate the new Creation begun with Christ's baptism. The rite of Epiphany celebrates the renewal of all Creation. That new Creation began with the baptism of the incarnate Son. The rite of baptism also presents the theme of a new creation. But it focuses upon the recreation of the individual human being.

<sup>3</sup>Bill McKibben, *The End of Nature* (New York, 1989), p. 91.



In the service of baptism, water is the primary element used for the act of blessing and consecration. However, the water itself must be exorcised of the demonic powers which have entered into it after the curse of the Fall and the Flood. A prayer of the Byzantine Orthodox rite of baptism richly expresses this reversal of the curse, as the water is revealed in its full life-giving quality.

We pray thee, O God, that every aerial and obscure phantom withdraw itself from us; and that no demon of darkness may conceal himself in this water; and that no evil spirit which instilleth darkening of intentions and rebelliousness of thought may descend into it with him (her) who is about to be baptized."

Only after such an exorcism is it possible for this same water to be known and declared as "the water of redemption, the water of sanctification, the purification of flesh and spirit, the loosing of bonds, the remission of sins, the illumination of the soul, the laver of regeneration, the renewal of the Spirit, the gift of adoption to sonship, the garment of incorruption, the fountain of life." This water of the font has been revealed anew as that very same water over which the Spirit hovered at the Creation and as the water of the Jordan River into which the Spirit descended at Christ's baptism. "Thou didst hallow the streams of Jordan, sending down upon them from heaven thy Holy Spirit, and didst crush the heads of the dragons who lurked there." The Armenian rite of baptism declares that this newly sanctified water will accomplish "the regeneration of all men," Christ having come "and saved *all creatures* (my emphasis)."

In the great prayer for the Armenian rite of Epiphany the cosmic life producing magnitude of the blessing of the waters is beautifully proclaimed. Here is some of the hymn of the blessing of the water.

To-day the grace of the Holy Spirit, hallowing the water, becomes co-worker (with Christ our God)./To-day the heavens gaily bedew from above with the dew of grace, and to-day shone forth on us the sun inextinguishable, and all the world is radiant with light./To-day the moon beams forth with a great light, and withal the world is filled with splendour./To-day the light-clad luminaries work hearty good unto all that dwell on earth./To-day clouds divine and dews divine bedew men from above./To-day the seas and gatherings of waters are spread

out for the path and foot-falls of the Lord./To-day the Hidden one is manifested, and the Unseen one is seen, that he may make us seers./To-day the Incarnate by his own creation, through a mystery, hath laid hands on him./To-day the Unhumbled humbly inclines his head to his own servant that he may free us from servitude./To-day he humbles the hills into servitude and makes the rivers as the sea. All that nature of the waters is blessed and hallowed. . . . /To-day come the currents of grace of the Holy Spirit, and all creatures are inundated therewith./To-day the briny waters of the sea are changed to sweetness, at the appearing of God. . . . /Today all creatures appear clad in splendour at the appearing of God./To-day the waters appear above for the salvation of the world./To-day the garden appears to mankind, and let us rejoice in righteousness unto eternal life. . . . /To-day the earth trembling, but joyfully, receives the Creator's footsteps upon it./To-day the sins and transgressions of the race of Adam are blotted out in the water of Jordan, and the earth's face is renewed at the appearing of God./To-day the shut and barred gate of the garden is opened to mankind . . .

The hymn is filled with allusions to the first chapters of Genesis. It celebrates the reversal of the Fall, as the curse is replaced by a new blessing and new covenant. Indeed, the hymn begins with a recollection of the entire creation account of Genesis 1 and the story of the Fall with its catastrophic results. Thus, when later we hear such things as "the light-clad luminaries" once again, and "work hearty good unto all that dwell on earth," what is being said is that the primal ecological system in which God intended all things to co-exist harmoniously and in interdependence has been restored. The new "inundation" does not bring death or destruction. Rather there is a blessing of "the grace of the Holy Spirit . . . for all creatures . . . inundated therewith." This means all of Creation participates in Christ's baptism. Lastly, the water has been prepared to receive the "foot-falls of the Lord" and the earth has been prepared to receive the "foot-falls of the Lord" and the earth "receives the Creator's footsteps upon it." This time, however, unlike those foot-falls heard by Adam and Eve in the garden after they had eaten of the forbidden fruit, these foot-falls bring news not of a curse but of new blessing. Now "the earth's face is renewed . . . the garden appears [anew] to

mankind" and "the shut and barred gate of the garden is opened."

### *Cleansing and Healing of Creation*

As we have already seen the theology of the rites of blessing present us with a cosmic notion of evil. Evil is not psychologized. It is not restricted to the human will. The waters, which stand for all of Creation, are themselves in need of exorcism. The human being is the priestly agent of that exorcism. The church cannot seriously pray that the water be redemptive when it is polluted. Redemption is possible only if, as priest, the human being acts to dispel the demonic in all things. "The Bible and the Christian faith reveal and experience matter, on the one hand, as essentially *good*, yet, on the other hand, as the very vehicle of man's fall and enslavement to death and sin, as the means by which Satan stole the world from God,"<sup>4</sup> wrote the Russian Orthodox theologian Alexander Schmemmann. And, he went on to argue: "The liberation of man begins with the liberation, i.e., the purification and the redemption, of matter, its restoration to its original function: to be a means of God's presence and, therefore, to be a protection and defense against the destructive 'demonic' reality."<sup>5</sup> In other words, there is no human salvation apart from the cleansing, restoration, and healing of the whole Creation.

In the communion prayer of the *Armenian Divine Liturgy* the celebrant implores of the Father "who hast called us by the name of thine Only-begotten and has enlightened us through the baptism of the spiritual font. . . . Impress upon us the graces of the Holy Spirit, as thou didst upon the holy apostles, who tasted thereof and became the cleansers of the whole world." Planetary waters which are filled with deadly chemicals can hardly stand as the symbol of life and the renewal thereof. A dirtied and polluted world is not something which can be offered back to God with thanksgiving for his divine love. The vocation of the apostles includes being healers and "cleansers of the whole world."

In the Old Testament the Hebrew word for salvation derives from *yasha*, meaning "to be at large," to save from a danger. Salvation in the Old Testament is expressed through metaphors for healing from sickness. In the New Testament the Greek *sozo* itself is derived from *saos* which means "healthy." Faith delivers persons, creatures,

<sup>4</sup>Schmemmann, *Of Water and Spirit* (Crestwood, 1974), p. 49.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*

and things into the care of a healing God. Armenian theology has retained a strong sense of this meaning of salvation.

An impressive example of this is the rite of the Washing of the Cross. The rite regards the Cross as a source of salvation not only for human beings but for plants and animals as well. The instructions indicate that the blessing is "for the healing of Plants, and Herbs, and Flocks, and of all disastrous Ailments." The central prayer of the rite recalls the first chapters of the book of Genesis, enumerating the works of creation and thanking God for them. Humanity is especially honored among God's creatures. But having fallen into "ruin and destruction," humankind also needs to be renewed through "the washing of the font," for God did "constitute the waters for purification and hallowing." The well-being and redemption of the rest of Creation depends upon the restoration in man of the divine image.

The prayer calls up the memory of the primal waters by which man came into being by the "eternal word [Christ]. Through him God "didst divide . . . [the] waters into those above and below and gather[ed] the remaining "into their several heaps; . . . out of which there issued, kind by kind, creeping things at thy command for the profit of man." God is beseeched to cleanse and return this water to a state in which it can be once again fit for the sacrament of salvation and healing.

And through the prophet Elisha thou didst bless waters that were pestiferous and deadly; and through the great Moses thou didst divide the victorious waters with a rod fashioned in the form of the cross and swallowing up the enemy in the depths. Thou gavest sweetness to the waters of Mera that welled forth a bitter spring, and didst replenish and slake the burning thirst of the people.

And now, Lord beneficent, send the same spirit of grace into these waters and bless the same with thy spotless right hand and with the life-giving power of the cross. . . . to the end that everyone who shall drink thereof may derive therefrom a medicine of souls and body; and a health from diseases which afflict.

This prayer is followed by a series of petitions. God is asked for his blessings and to restore the water to its primal curative and regenerative power. The Cross is declared to be the instrument of

that restoration as it is immersed in the water in figuration of Christ's baptism.

Bless, O Lord, this water, and hallow it with thy holy cross, in order that the flocks and sheep which may approach and drink of the same, may derive therefrom freedom from disease and fertility; for from them we select sacrifices of fragrant sweetness and offer them as victims to thyself.

In the second petitionary prayer God is asked to grant that the water, "impart to the fields . . . harvests wherefrom we have fine flour as an offering of holiness unto thy Lordship." This reminds us that we must, when we receive God's blessing, always keep in mind that thanksgiving be returned to God. The "fine flour" is made into the bread of the Holy Sacrifice.

This rite of the Washing of the Cross thus suggests at least two meanings for the phrase "for the profit of man" which appears at the start of the prayer of blessing. On the one hand, animal and vegetal life is "useful" to human beings in that it is the source of nourishment, clothing, shelter, and pleasure. On the other hand, the worth of God's creatures is more than merely relative to man and his needs. Such life is of inestimable and inherent value to the Life-giver himself. This life comes to us already as a gift. This alone qualifies animals and plants to be appropriate sacrifices and gifts to God.

So far as I am aware, the Armenian Church does not use this rite of the Washing of the Cross in the United States. But one can readily imagine the *public*, and I want to emphasize public, uses it could be put to (together with the rite of the blessing of the water) — at polluted rivers, in places where wild animals are dying or an endangered, in times of drought, or in places where the earth's fertility is diminished by acid rain. Some, perhaps many observers, would view these publicly enacted rites as quaint or a kind of Christian magic. But Christians will know them as acts consistent with their vocation as priests and stewards of Creation. By demonstratively performing such rites, Christians hope to insure that their children grow into men and women serious about preserving and taking care of God's good Creation. And perhaps, with the help of God's grace, through such acts others might be persuaded of the truth of biblical faith and the rightness of valuing the Creation as God would have us do.

There is an Armenian rite more familiar than the rite of the

Washing of the Cross which also is a resource for ecological ministry. It is the rite of the Blessing of the Field (*Antasdan*). This rite expresses ever so succinctly the ecological vision of the Armenian Church and how closely that vision is tied to what Christians understand as God's total plan of salvation for all the Creation. In it priest and worshipers move through procession to a field which represents the whole world. The congregation circles the field and, in so doing, turns first toward the east, then to the west, north, and south — the four corners of the world. At these turnings, the "divine care" is beseeched for the earth with its fields and crops, monasteries and churches, villages and cities, and ecclesiastic and secular offices.

### *Ecology as Church Centered Event*

From the very beginning of the Bible we hear that God's providence oversees the whole of his Creation. God is concerned with the well-being and flourishing of all created things. This divine plan for the salvation of all Creation was revealed in its fulness and accomplished wholly in Jesus Christ. Further, Armenian theology insists that the Incarnation does not concern merely the correction of something that has gone wrong. Rather, it completes God's purpose at Creation. This is about the flourishing of all life. Thus, a traditional Armenian cross sprouts blossoming branches.

No biblical story better depicts how even God's anger and judgment do not ultimately thwart his intention that all living things should flourish than the story of Noah and the Flood. All of earth's creatures take shelter in the ark with Noah and his family. Early in Christian theology and liturgy the ark itself became interpreted as a type or foreshadowing of the church. In the First Epistle of Peter we read: "Christ also died once for all . . . that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit; in which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is eight persons, were saved through water. Baptism . . . corresponds to this" (1 Pet 3.20-21 RSV). Saint Cyprian of Carthage, commenting upon this text, wrote: "Peter also affirmed when he showed that the Church is one and that only those who are within the Church are able to be baptized [that the ark is a type of the baptism in the Church]." "In the ark of Noah," observed Saint Cyprian, "a very few (eight souls all told) were saved by water. And it is in just the same manner that baptism will save you also."

By this testimony Cyprian established that "the ark of Noah (one only) was a type of the Church (also one)."<sup>6</sup> Saint Cyril of Jerusalem also argued that the ark is a type of the universal church. "drawing together into one will the wills of all nations," of whom "the various dispositions of the animals in the ark were a figure." Cyril then extended the metaphor to a vision of the new creation when, with the coming of the "true Noah [meaning Christ], . . . the spiritual wolves [would] feed with the lambs, in whose Church the calf, and the lion, and the fox, feed in the same pasture."<sup>7</sup> An Armenian text attributed to Agathangelos, in his *History of the Armenians*, speaks similarly: "You who saved Noah from the watery flood, save us from the flood of impieties that surround us. For if you saved the beasts and the animals in the ark, how much more will you care for your images that glorify you."<sup>8</sup>

Saint Cyprian, Saint Cyril, and Agathangelos bring together three biblical images which are important to a Christian understanding of ecology. These images are: 1) the gathering into the ark of all the creatures of the earth, 2) the church as antitype (or fulfillment) of the ark in which the ingathering of all Creation is completed, and 3) the image of the future new Creation in which the original peace and harmony of the garden is restored and all things flourish. The Bible invites us to conclude that the curse imposed by the Flood turns to a blessing which extends to the *entire paterfamilias* of Noah. Thus, in Genesis 9.8-10 God's salvation is described as including all living creatures: "God spoke to Noah and his sons: 'I now make may covenant with you and with your descendents after you, and with every living creature that is with you, all birds and cattle, all wild animals with you on earth, all that have come out of the ark' " (NEB).

In closing, permit to offer one final juxtaposition of images from the tradition which shows us how closely ecology is connected to the Christian understanding of salvation in the Church. I want to place the

<sup>6</sup>Cyprian of Carthage, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*, trans. G.W. Clarke, in *Ancient Christian Writers*, vol. 47 (New York/Mahwah, 1989), p. 34 (letter 69). It is worth recalling that the central portion of the Christian temple is called the nave (f. *navis* in medieval Latin). The name for this section of the church in Armenian is *nav*, which means, quite literally, a ship.

<sup>7</sup>"The Catechetical Lectures," in *Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 7 (Grand Rapids, 1978), p. 176 (lecture 16.10).

<sup>8</sup>Robert W. Thomson, trans. *Agathangelos: History of the Armenians* (Albany, 1976), p. 179.

Genesis description of Noah and his family sharing the ark with all of the earth's creatures beside the image of the Nativity preserved iconographically in all the Orthodox churches, including the Armenian Church. In Eastern Christian icons of Christ's birth, an ox and an ass stand close by the manger at the center of the picture. The two beasts depict the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah: "The ox knows its owner and the ass its master's crib" (Isaiah 1.3 RSV). Here the animal creation is depicted as not only included in God's old, but also in his new, covenant. The beasts take their place permanently within the household of God. The church as God's vehicle into the new Creation is a household which, like the ark before it, embraces in hospitality, thanksgiving, and blessing all living creatures. Together with a redeemed humanity, the beasts and all God's creatures welcome joyfully the Incarnate Lord who is their Savior. In the words of a Byzantine hymn: "What shall we offer Thee, O Christ, who for our sakes hast appeared on earth as man? Every creature made by Thee offers Thee thanks."<sup>9</sup>

#### *A Postscript*

In the spring of 1990, I visited Armenia for the first time. The morning after my arrival, I made the pilgrimage to the cathedral of Holy Etchmiadzin. The liturgy for that Sunday commemorated the Feast Day of Saint Gregory the Enlightener, the founder of the Armenian Church, who laid the foundation of the cathedral in 301. I was granted the privilege of being seated with several dozen other people just in front of the high altar under the central dome. The music was exquisite and transporting. Yet there was a joyful surprise still to come. At the hymn of communion, just as the choir sang, "Christ is sacrificed and shared amongst us. Alleluia. . . /Praise the Lord in the heavens. Alleluia./Praise ye him in the heights. Alleluia./Praise ye him, all his angels. Alleluia./Praise ye him, all his hosts, Alleluia," birds high in the great dome and east bell tower burst forth in chorus. Their song broke the silence of the painted images of the heavenly hosts above. Or perhaps their song was the very voice of those hosts.

<sup>9</sup>Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, trans., *The Festal Menaion* (London, 1977), p. 254.



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Book Reviews

---

*Emperors, Patriarchs and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century — Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* By Marios Philippides. The Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources No. 13. N. M. Vaporis, General Editor. Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1990. Pp. 192. Hard, \$22.95. Soft, \$14.95.

Presented and funded by Bishop Methodios of Boston in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of Archbishop Iakovos as Greek Orthodox Archbishop of the Americas, *Emperors, Patriarchs and Sultans of Constantinople* has been astutely put together by Marios Philippides, Professor of Classics at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. It includes an introduction that sets the background for the Greek text and translation, a list of abbreviations (really a bibliography), a generous number of notes, lists of the Emperors (1373-1453), Patriarchs (1373-1543), Sultans (1373-1543), and Popes (1373-1543), a select bibliography, and indices of persons, places, and Turkish words. Because no documents of an official nature concerning the Porte and the Patriarchate from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have survived, Patriarchal chronicles of the sixteenth century, even if not of the caliber of Doukas, Kritoboulos or Chalkondyles, were important for supporting the claims of the Patriarchate vis-à-vis the Ottoman Sultanate. The earliest source for these chronicles seems to have been a work by the Metropolitan of Naupaktos and Arta, Damaskenos the Studite, who was originally from Thessalonike and whose floruit is generally set in the middle of the sixteenth century. His most important work, *A History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople* (from the age of Constantine the Great to his own time), was apparently finished in ca. 1572. It is in the last section of that work that he discussed the history of the Patriarchate after the con-

quest of Constantinople by Mehmet II.

From what can be surmised, all other chronicles which are extant and concern themselves with events of this period, are derived, either directly or indirectly, from Damaskenos' *History*, a significant portion of which was copied and published in 1872, though the complete history, still in the Patriarchal Library, has yet to appear in print.

Philippides appropriately calls our attention to the fact that it was Manuel Malaxos in his *History of the Patriarchate of Constantinople*, written sometime after the middle of the sixteenth century, who supplied most of the evidence for the history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the early period (published by Martinus Crusius, professor of Greek at Tübingen, who, through Lutheran Chaplain Stephen Gerlach, was in regular correspondence with officials and *literati* at the Patriarchate, resulting in his monumental *Germano-Graecia* and *Turco-Graecia*, our two main sources for the history of Constantinople and of the Greeks under the Ottoman sultans). Theodosios Zygomalas, a *protonotarios* of the Patriarchate who befriended Crusius, sent Crusius an edited (corrected) copy of Manuel Malaxos' *History of the Patriarchate of Constantinople* and his *Political History of Constantinople* in 1581. Certain passages of Malaxos' work dealing with the enthronement of Gennadios II and his successors are incorporated in one way or another, in a work attributed to George Sphrantzes (1401-1477), the *Chronicon Maius*, but which turns out to be the work of the forger, Makarios Melissenos-Melissourgos (fl. ca. 1580). Malaxos' work is now considered to be largely derived from Damaskenos.

The text that Philippides reproduces and translates quite ably and clearly is, in many cases, identical to the text of Malaxos and Damaskenos. It begins chronologically with the year 1391 and concludes somewhere between 1517 and 1543. The original sources remain a mystery but, in the words of our translator/commentator: "As this work seems to be one of the earliest that we possess on the affairs of post-Byzantine Constantinople, it becomes one of our vital sources of information for the relations between the Patriarchate and the Porte, at least in regard to the officials of the Great Church" (p. 20). Some of the details contained in this document are considered to be authentic and may even be eye-witness accounts of the Fall of Constantinople and events associated with it, even if there have been textual changes, revisions, and elaborations over the years.

Dr. Philippides reprints the text from the *Codex Oxoniensis*-

*Lincolnensis*, first edited and published by Constantine Sathas in *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi*, vol. 7 (Paris, 1894), but has also examined the version in M. Crusius (1584), reprinted by I. Bekker (1849), and the critical edition by S. Lampros in *Ecthesis Chronica* and *Chronicon Athenarum* (1902). Though we do not know the name of the author or his exact sources, he clearly shows a deep interest in the Ottoman Empire, especially after the Fall of Constantinople, and details the reigns of Mehmet II, Bayezid II, and Salim I, plus the early history of the Great Church of Constantinople under the Ottoman sultans, and includes digressions on Italy (especially Venice), Hungary, and Persia. His Greek style is mildly archaic and his command of ancient Greek is not particularly impressive. His use of language and knowledge of the early Patriarchate suggest that he was probably associated with the Great Church in some official capacity.

Marios Philippides has done us a great service by making available a very useful source for the study of Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople for the period 1373-1513. It is a source that no reputable historian of this period can afford to neglect.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church: Its Faith, History, and Practice.* By Demetrios J. Constantelos. Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1990. Pp. xiv. + 220. Soft, \$14.95.

*Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* was originally published by The Seabury Press of New York in 1982 and drew materials that previously appeared in the author's *The Greek Orthodox Church* (New York, 1967); *Marriage, Sexuality, Celibacy: A Greek Orthodox Perspective* (Minneapolis, 1975); from articles in *The Orthodox Observer*, *The Way*, *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, *Concilium*, and the *Jurist*, and from public lectures and sermons delivered by the author. The original edition contained 178 pages, while the new, enlarged and revised edition contains 220 pages. The organization of the new edition is the same as the previous edition, with the addition of material on the Greek Orthodox in Great Britain and the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia. The Index of Biblical Quotations has been omitted from the 1990 edition and the Bibliography expanded.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

*Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance, and Use of Money.* By Justo L. Gonzalez. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1990. Pp. 240, \$19.95.

The study of the patristic sources for the Church's social teaching is a field that is only gradually developing in the modern world. This volume on the Fathers and New Testament teaching on economics is a welcome contribution to the literature. The fact that it is written by an ecumenically sensitive scholar in a style and format that make easy reading should be a stimulus to wider understanding of the patristic teaching in this field.

The book is divided into four parts: the background in Greek, Roman, and Jewish institutions and cultures; the period before Constantine in the Scriptures and first two centuries; the period from Constantine to Chrysostom and Augustine; and finally a retrospective. The retrospective gives not only the author's conclusions, but also his method of approach. He documents, carefully, the continuity of the patristic teaching with the New Testament material and influences from preChristian or nonChristian culture. He also points out differences of points of view within the Church and between Church teachers and the culture at large. In this, of course, he carefully documents the role of the emerging structures of catholic orthodoxy and monasticism.

It is the thesis of the author that the Fathers are no less interested in the social mission of the Church than present-day Christians are called to be, but that this element of the patristic heritage has been of less interest to the patristic scholar than it was, for example, in the life and work of Chrysostom. Indeed, he carefully documents the interplay of the social teaching of leaders like Athanasios and their teaching on the Incarnation and the Trinity.

From this text, and the patristic data it so skillfully summarizes, one can understand why these sources are so important today in places like Latin America, and why theologians, like the Cappadocians, are central in the work of some of the Liberation Theologians. The center of renewal, as the center of unity in Christ, is always the orthodox faith and its teachers through the centuries. This volume should help to broaden this understanding of our common ground in tradition.

Jeffrey Gros  
National Council of Churches of Christ, USA

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

levels for the various groups of the blessed and correspond to the various levels in the Ark and on Mount Sinai. The mountain is conically shaped. Under the Old Covenant the Tree of Life was hidden from humanity, only to be revealed with the Crucifixion. As the source of immortality, "the Tree of Life is the symbol of the Son of the Living One," whose eucharistic fruit is plucked daily in the Church.

Clothing imagery is the most striking imagery in Saint Ephrem. Adam and Eve are stripped of a "Robe of Glory"; God "puts on names" in the scriptures; Christ "puts on the body" at the Incarnation; the Christian is said to "put on Christ." In Sebastian Brock's most appropriate words: "The Robe of Glory . . . provides the thread which links up between the primordial and the eschatological Paradise, and the mention of it in any context is intended immediately to conjure up in the reader's mind the entire span of salvation history, thus admirably emphasizing, for example, the place of each individual Christian's Baptism within the divine economy as a whole" (p. 67). One could say that Saint Ephrem is concerned with the elevation of the body to the level of the soul; the soul to the level of the spirit; and the spirit to the level of God's majesty, as indeed Saint Ephrem does say in Hymn 8.21.

Certainly *Hymns on Paradise* has a theological vision that is as fresh today as it was when it was originally written and a poetic appeal that is timeless.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Fasting in the Orthodox Church: Its Theological, Pastoral, and Social Implications.* By Archimandrite Akakios. Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1990. Pp. 107. \$6.50, soft.

The issue of fasting in the contemporary Orthodox Church has become a confused one, and it is a very positive sign that we have Constantine Cavarinos' *Fasting and Science* (translated and edited by Bishop Chrysostomos in 1988), originally published in Athens in Greek in 1988 as *Nesteia kai Episteme*, and now Archimandrite Akakios' *Fasting in the Orthodox Church* as handy resources that can be used by laity and clergy alike.

The archimandrite has produced a notably clear and authoritative study of the subject in four very closely packed chapters entitled



(1) "Fasting in the Eastern Orthodox Church: The Legacy of the Early Church"; (2) "Ascetism and Eastern Christian Spirituality: A Theological Treatment of Fasting"; (3) "Fasting and Contemporary Orthodoxy in the Americas"; and (4) "Fasting and Pastoral Concerns." The ten page bibliography (98-107) is one of the very best features and aids that the book provides.

Father Akakios very early cites the relationship of fasting to the Resurrection experience, quoting Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia, who has stated that a "sense of resurrection joy . . . from the foundation of all the worship of the Orthodox Church," which, "for us to experience the full power of this Paschal rejoicing, each of us needs to pass through a time of preparation" (p. 7). Fasting is "an essential part of the process of preparation that leads to an Orthodox Christian's participation in the church's worship, again a worship which is at all times inextricably bound to the Resurrection experience" (ibid.). The author makes an excellent beginning to a subject whose practice he traces back to the Old Testament and which can be found widely in the New Testament, with directives and comments of the Orthodox Church Fathers on fasting found in their writings and in the regulations of the seven Ecumenical Synods. Much emphasized is the idea of fasting as a precursor to spiritual feasting.

For those interested in the particulars of the calendar of fasting days, these are dealt with historically and theologically. All Wednesdays and Fridays (as well as Mondays for monastics) are fast days on which fish, meat, dairy products, wine, and oil are prohibited unless they fall on significant feast days. Father Akakios notes the traditional exceptions, while also noting that Orthodox Christians observe four long periods: The Great Lent or the Great Fast; the Dormition Fast; the Nativity or Advent Fast; and the Fast of the Holy Apostles, plus the Feasts of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross and the Beheading of Saint John the Baptist. Noted too is that the Church's canons proscribe any fasting that would jeopardize one's health (the infirm, elderly, pregnant women, or nursing mothers). The ultimate goal is always *theosis* (divinization) through which the individual participates in God's perfection and blessedness. Cleansing of the passions paves the way for restoration, even on earth, of an intimate communion with God, of participation in the "divine nature," in divinization (*theosis*). Even for the ascetic, Father Akakios stresses that "Fasting is not a simple adherence to laws or a method of simple discipline, but always aims towards this restoration of the body and the spirit

in a therapeutic sense" (p. 50) — not as in the West, with the idea of mortification of the flesh. Fasting, in ascetic practice, offers the opportunity for restoration of human perfection and is a positive means by which negative human elements are eliminated. Again, the true aim is the restoration of the human being to full communion with God.

Though Father Akakios discusses the relations of the Traditionalist Orthodox to the mainstream Orthodox in Greece and in North America and their competing jurisdictions, especially in terms of the observation of their fasting practices, these pages should be read constructively and in an irenic spirit as suggestions for preserving traditional Orthodox practice.

*Fasting in the Orthodox Church* is a book that should be carefully examined and put to positive use. It is an excellent contribution to a better understanding of a much misunderstood subject.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine.* By Yiannis E. Meimaris (Athens, 1986). Pp. 292, soft.

*The Monastery of Saint Euthymios the Great at Khan et-Ahmet, in the Wilderness of Judaea.* Idem (Athens, 1989). Pp. 120, soft.

Rare are the scholars so qualified to carry on research and write books like these two under review. Excellently trained in ancient (Greek, Hebrew, Arabic) and modern languages, in paleography, theology, archeology, and philosophy, Dr. Yiannis E. Meimaris has produced first rate scholarship of interest to students of early Christianity, church history, Eastern monasticism, and hagiology. He is a charismatic researcher who has also prepared the Catalogue of the new Arabic manuscripts of Saint Katherine's Monastery of Mount Sinai, discovered in a crypt of the Monastery in 1975.

The first volume under review was published under the aegis of the Research Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, volume two in its *Meletemata* (studies). Based on his doctoral thesis at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the book's purpose is to present the life of the church in Byzantine Palestine as it appears in epigraphical material which has survived

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

H. Browder); and *The Nazirite in Ancient Judaism: Selected Texts* (Steven D. Fraade).

"The Ritual and Revelation" section includes *Hēkalôt Rabbatī* 297-306: *A Ritual for the Cultivation of the Prince of the Torah* (Michael D. Swartz); *Allogenes: Nag Hammadi Codex XI 3* (Richard Valantasis); and Evagrius Ponticus, *Antirrheticus: Selections* (Michael O'Laughlin). The "Life and Teachings" sections draws from Pseudo-Athanasius, *The Life and Activity of the Holy and Blessed Teacher Syncletica* (Elizabeth A. Castelli); Zacharias, *The Life of Severus* (Robin A. Darling Young); Ethiopian Moses, *Collected Sources* (Kathleen O'Brien Wicker); *Theodore's Entry Into the Pachomian Movement: Selections from the Life of Pachomius* (James E. Goehring); Jerome, *Life of Paul, The First Hermit* (Paul B. Harvey, Jr.); *The Story of Mygdonia and Tertia from Acts of Thomas* (Virginia Burrus and Karen Jo Torjesen); Chaeremon the Stoic on Egyptian Temple Askesis: From Porphyry, *On Abstinence* 4:6-8 (Anitra Bingham Kolenkow); and *The Life of Chariton* (Leah DiSegni).

The "Documentary Evidence" contains the richly illustrated "*Life of Chariton: In Light of Archaeological Research*" by Yizhar Herschfeld; "Canons from the Council of Gangra" (introduced by James E. Goehring and translated by Robert F. Boughner).

*Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity* is the product of a scholarly attempt to provide an integrated view of a subject whose diversity reflects complexity rather than simplicity. It is a book that is intended as a resource for historians, and social scientists as well as for ancient historians, theologians, and patristic scholars. The translations as a whole are very well done; the individual introductions often involve interpretations that are often *au courant* and will need careful reexamination and exegesis. The whole project is intended to be objective in as scholarly a way as possible.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe.* Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. xv + 404. Hardbound. \$36.95.

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians* is a Festschrift honoring Abraham

J. Malherbe, Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale Divinity School and student of the legendary Arthur Darby Nock of Harvard, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. The twenty-two contributors have sought to honor a scholar who for more than three decades has through his publications and teaching pointed out new ways for understanding early Christian texts and communities in relation to Greco-Roman philosophy, literature, and culture. His students and colleagues have extended his work by their own contributions, especially in areas that show the interaction between Greco-Roman culture and early Christianity, such as Hellenistic philosophy, literature, rhetoric, anthropology, ethics, and urban life. Part One of this book contains ten essays on the Schools of Hellenistic Philosophy. Part Two contains five essays on Hellenistic Literature and Rhetoric. Part Three has two essays on Hellenistic Anthropology. Part Four includes four essays on Hellenistic Social Behavior, and Part Five one essay on archaeology. There is a Preface by the Editors, a list of contributors, a very brief Introduction, a bibliography of the works of Abraham J. Malherbe, and indices of Classical and Early Literature, of Judaeo-Christian Scriptures, and of Modern Authors.

Part One of this fitting tribute to an influential New Testament scholar focuses on the philosophers. David E. Aune of St. Xavier College (Chicago) begins with "Heracles and Christ: Heracles Imagery in the Christology of Early Christianity" (3-19), in which he concludes that there is no evidence that the Heracles imagery played a significant role in the formation of legendary episodes about Jesus in the canonical Gospels, while Ronald F. Hock of the University of Southern California in "A Dog in the Manger: The Cynic Cynuculus among Athenaeus' Deipnosophists" (20-37) provides us with an analysis of the best documented of all imperial Cynics on the culinary customs and intellectual world of a learned symposium that highlights polymathy but also shows Cynuculus as a critic of the dominant literary ethos of the symposia. Willem S. Vorster of the University of South Africa in his essay "Stoics and Early Christians on Blessedness" (38-50) concentrates on happiness in Epictetus and the Stoic tradition, early Christian views on happiness, and on a few parallel statements concerning happiness in Stoicism and the New Testament, and concludes that for Christians happiness is something that comes from God and is not simply the goal of life, as it was for the Stoics, while David L. Balch of Texas Christian University in "The Areopagus Speech: An Appeal to the Stoic Historian Posidonius

against Later Stoics and Epicureans" (52-79) offers the reader insights into Posidonius' views of providence in nature and history and his opposition to images of the gods in temples, pointing out that Stoics like Dio Chrysostom and Epicureans philosophically supported images. Carl R. Holladay of Emory University in "1 Corinthians 13: Paul as Apostolic Paradigm" (80-98) studies the highly rhetorical form and function of this epistle to demonstrate that we are dealing in this section with epistolary parenesis, in which Paul is himself presented in the first person as a paradigm of parental love, just as Epictetus does in the catechetical relationship in his *Discourses* and Isocrates in the epistle to Demonicus. Susan R. Garrett of the Yale Divinity School in "The God of This World and the Affliction of Paul: 2 Cor 4.1-2" (99-117), evaluates the relationship between popular representations of the afflicted sage and influences from Jewish apocalyptic literature as they overlap in 2 Corinthians and shows that Paul is confident that because of his endurance God will rescue him from Death's dominion. Jerome H. Neyrey, S. J., of the Weston School of Theology, in his contribution entitled "Acts 17, Epicureans, and Theodicy: A Study in Stereotypes" (118-34) provides a good study of Epicurean denials of theodicy as contrasted to Christian affirmations asserted by Paul, of God as judge, human survival of death, and of postmortem retribution, and the thesis that the Areopagus speech is about right and wrong theology, criticizing idols but positively affirming God's providence, especially, theodicy. Benjamin Fiore, S. J., of Canisius College (Buffalo) in "Passion in Paul and Plutarch: 1 Corinthians 5-6 and the Polemic against Epicureans" (135-43) uses Plutarch's polemic against the Epicureans to help us understand the discussions of incest, lawsuits, and frequenting prostitutes in 1 Corinthians 5-6 and demonstrating that 1 Cor 6.12-20 is a Christian counterpart to Plutarch's idealistic treatment of the same problem raised by Epicurean atomistic materialism. Hans-Josef Klauck of the University of Würzburg (West Germany) in his "Brotherly Love in Plutarch and in 4 Maccabees" (144-56) cites parallels between Middle Platonist Plutarch and 4 Maccabees and similar views on brotherly love in the epistles of John, and though no direct literary dependence of 4 Maccabees in Plutarch is claimed, both are shown to stand in a broad history of tradition that is older than either work. In the last essay in this section by Everett Ferguson of Abilene Christian University on "Was Barnabas a Chiliast? An Example of Hellenistic Number Symbolism in *Barnabas* and Clement of Alexandria" (157-67) the

conclusion is reached that despite differences in terminology, Barnabas was neither a Chiliast nor a Gnostic.

Part Two, half the size of Part One, concentrates on Hellenistic Literature and Rhetoric. The first essay in this group is contributed by William S. Kurz, S. J., of Marquette University on "Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts" (171-89), in which a survey of Hellenistic rhetorical ideals and examples and its milieu indicates that many such common paradigmatic uses of Luke-Acts are not far from the original text and that a significant number of narratives in Luke and Acts are specially molded and redacted to supply clear models for imitation. John T. Fitzgerald of the University of Miami in "Paul, the Ancient Epistolary Theorists, and 2 Corinthians 10-13: The Purpose and Literary Genre of a Pauline Letter" (190-200) through an examination of various epistolary theorists offers the view that 2 Corinthians 10-13 is an excellent example of a mixed letter type, while L. Michael White of Oberlin College in "Morality between Two Worlds: A Paradigm of Friendship in Philippians" (201-15) shows that Philippians is a Pauline adaptation of the Hellenistic moral paradigm of *philia* (friendship), whereas Thomas H. Olbricht of Pepperdine University in "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians" (216-36) proposes a new genre, "church rhetoric," with various subgenres, including reconfirmational, the genre of 1 Thessalonians. Dieter Lührmann of Philipps-Universität (Marburg/Lahn, West Germany) in his "The Beginnings of the Church at Thessalonica" (237-49) stresses the importance of ethics as a question of pastoral care for the newly founded Thessalonica congregation, underlining, as it does, the power of parenesis.

Part Three embraces only two essays. Stanley K. Stowers of Brown University contributes "Paul on the Use and Abuse of Reason" (253-86) in which he challenges traditional views by demonstrating that Paul opposes a Stoic and Epicurean view of human reason as a therapy of the passions (as reflected in 1 Corinthians 8, 2 Corinthians 10, and Romans 14:1), pointing out that the view of reason as a fortress of the wiser is elitist and individualist, as against Paul's goal in his work, which was communal, and stresses that Paul believed that human fragility, vulnerability, and limitedness should be accepted as opportunities for service to others and for the display of God's mercy and power. Pieter Willem Van Der Horst of the University of Utrecht (The Netherlands) in "Sarah's Seminal Emission: Hebrews 11.11 in the Light of Ancient Embryology" (287-302) surveys

Greco-Roman and rabbinic literature from 500 B. C. to 200 A. D. and concludes that many philosophers, physicians, and poets believed that men and women contributed equally to the formation of the fetus, while others denied that the female contributed to embryogenesis.

The four essays in Part Four are concerned with Hellenistic Social Behavior. Wayne Meeks of Yale University offers "The Circle of Reference in Pauline Morality" (305-17), in which he notes that Pauline Christianity is an idealized construct; that multiple reference groups are implicit in the exhortations in Paul's epistles; and that the dominant reference groups and individuals in Paul's admonitions are peculiar to the movement, and outsiders are often a negative reference group, yet the Pauline stance is not simply counter-cultural, while Bernard C. Lategan of the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa) in his essay "Is Paul Developing a Specifically Christian Ethics in Galatians" (318-28) concludes from his investigation of the nature and style of Paul's ethic in Galatians that Paul in terms of content is neither introducing new concepts or proposing a line of conduct that is in conflict with the conventional morality of the time but gives new substance to freedom and universality of the new existence in faith with the ideal of a creative and participating ethics, and, together with empowerment, Paul is aiming at participation. Luke Timothy Johnson of Indiana University in "Taciturnity and True Religion: James 1.26-27" (329-39) surveys the rationalizations given in Hellenistic moral literature and examines James against that background. Marinus de Jonge of the University of Leiden (The Netherlands) in "Rachel's Virtuous Behavior in the *Testament of Issachar*" (340-52) finds that no conclusion can be reached about the origins of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* but the ideas about marriage expressed in the *Testament of Issachar* 2 may be derived from a Jewish author and may have been taken over unchanged when this work was adapted for Christian use, but that, at any rate, the *Testaments* offer evidence for the continuity of ethical thought in Hellenistic-Jewish and early Christian circles.

Part Five on Archaeology consists of a single essay by Helmut Koester of the Harvard Divinity School on "Melikertes at Isthmia: A Roman Mystery Cult" (355-66), whose discussion of an important Corinthian sanctuary stresses that through such archaeological information we can learn more about the urban world of St. Paul.

Finally, Stephen L. Peterson, Librarian of the Yale Divinity School, provides as complete a Bibliography of Works by Abraham J.



Malherbe as is possible at this time but with the caution that some articles and book reviews may be missing.

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians* is an international effort honoring an internationally recognized scholar who continues to contribute to our better understanding of the interaction between Greco-Roman culture and Christianity and who has inspired a significant number of other Western scholars to do likewise. It is, to be sure, a Western Christian effort that needs to be examined critically by Eastern Christian scholars as well. Though there will be differences in interpretation, the effort is meant to provide us with a fuller understanding of the world in which early Christianity developed.

*John E. Rexine*  
Colgate University

*Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology.* By Constantine N. Tsirpanlis. Theology and Life Series 30. A Michael Glazier Book. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991. Pp. viii + 277. \$16.95, soft.

Introductory texts and general surveys on any subject are much more difficult to write than books on single, specified topics. The writer must be able to draw on a vast array of original and secondary sources and his/her own ingenuity to provide the reader with an authoritative yet clearly understandable and pedagogically ordered text. Dr. Constantine Tsirpanlis, who teaches Church History, Patristics, and Orthodox Theology at Unification Theological Seminary in Barrytown, New York and is President and Founder of the American Institute for Patristic and Byzantine Studies and Editor of its *Patristic and Byzantine Review*, has capitalized on his fourteen years of continuous teaching in these areas to publish his lectures and notes, not to replace any available manual or handbook of patrology, nor as "a descriptive analysis of patristic writings, that is, but a thematic interpretative study of patristic thought; a clear, concise, and objective presentation of the views of the Greek Fathers on Creation (Cosmology), Anthropology-Mariology, Christology-Soteriology, Pneumatology-Ecclesiology-Hagiology-Asceticism, and Eschatology" (p. 17). The book is consequently divided into the aforementioned five major topical sections. The audience at which

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Messiah.

Certainly, *Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* can open the way for those who wish to learn something about the Greek Orthodox Church, but it can also provide the starting point for much further exploration and study. For Orthodox Christians it can provide a compact, easily read and understood review of what they are, where they have been, and where they are going as a church and faith community.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Hymns on Paradise.* By St. Ephrem the Syrian. Introduction and Translation by Sebastian Brock. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990. Pp. 240. \$8.95, soft.

From a cycle of hymns on the town of Nisibis (modern Nusaybin in southeastern Turkey), we are informed that Saint Ephrem served as a deacon and catechetical teacher under a series of unusual bishops, the first of whom was Saint Jacob of Nisibis, one of the 318 Fathers who attended the Council of Nicea in 325. It was this bishop who appointed Ephrem to a teaching post. Nisibis was besieged by the Persians on three different occasions (338, 346, and 350) and after its occupation by the Persians, Saint Ephrem, who was then in his late fifties, fled to Edessa (the modern Urfa), where he spent his last decade in a more Hellenized environment. He most likely died in 373.

Saint Ephrem was a prolific writer who wrote numerous hymns, four hundred of which have come down to us and even more have been lost. He also wrote verse homilies and several prose works, including biblical commentaries and treatises against various heretical writers. His commentaries especially contain profound insights, and that on Genesis is the most important, since it provides useful background to *The Hymns on Paradise*. The translator has conveniently provided a translation of the section dealing with Genesis 2-3. The most accessible of Saint Ephrem's commentaries has been *Diatessaron (Harmony of the Four Gospels)*, until recently known only in an early Armenian translation, but with the discovery of the Syriac original in 1956 (at least in part), a subsequent French translation of the entire commentary became available in *Sources Chrétiennes*.

Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Saint Paul are available only in Armenian. Ephrem was famous as a writer to the Syriac and Greco-Roman worlds. His most important works are the great hymn cycles that are characterized by highly imaginative use of imagery and artistry in his use of language, together with depth of thought, that have established his distinction as an outstanding poet.

The cycle of fifteen *Hymns on Paradise*, now available in an expert and readable translation by Sebastian Brock, Fellow of Wolfson College, Oxford, and University Lecturer in Aramaic and Syriac, offers us the opportunity to examine first-hand the theological synthesis that Saint Ephrem was able to provide around a particular biblical reading, revealing the sacramental character of the created world and the potential of all creation to witness to the Creator, even if "The ontological gap between God the Creator and his creation is in fact impassable as far as any created being is concerned, and any knowledge of, or statement about, God would be impossible had not God himself taken the initiative and bridged this chasm . . . The mode of his self-revelation is essentially threefold: by means of types and symbols which are operative in both Nature and in Scripture, by allowing Himself — the indescribable — to be described in Scripture in human terms and language, and then, supremely, by actually becoming part of the created world, at the Incarnation" (p. 41).

The "hidden" and the "revealed" are essential elements in Saint Ephrem's structure of thought, indicating a dynamic tension that exists between their use as symbols and sacraments that point to an objective reality, which can only be experienced in this life in a subjective and hidden way. Subjectively, hiddenness refers to knowledge of God, through the reality of the Incarnation, of which there were glimpses expressed as symbols in the Old Testament. Ephrem emphasizes "things revealed" to stress the partial nature of the revelation.

Saint Ephrem's topographical description of Paradise presents the reader with a circular mountain that encircles the "Great Sea." The Flood reached only the foothills where a fence or barrier was guarded by the Cherub with revolving sword. Halfway up was the Tree of Knowledge which constituted an internal boundary beyond which entrance was forbidden to Adam and Eve. This Tree served as the sanctuary curtain that concealed the Holy of Holies, which is the Tree of Life higher up, while on the summit resided the Divine Presence, the Shekhina. Paradise mountain is also depicted as made up of three concentric circles which separate the mountain into three

levels for the various groups of the blessed and correspond to the various levels in the Ark and on Mount Sinai. The mountain is conically shaped. Under the Old Covenant the Tree of Life was hidden from humanity, only to be revealed with the Crucifixion. As the source of immortality, "the Tree of Life is the symbol of the Son of the Living One," whose eucharistic fruit is plucked daily in the Church.

Clothing imagery is the most striking imagery in Saint Ephrem. Adam and Eve are stripped of a "Robe of Glory"; God "puts on names" in the scriptures; Christ "puts on the body" at the Incarnation; the Christian is said to "put on Christ." In Sebastian Brock's most appropriate words: "The Robe of Glory . . . provides the thread which links up between the primordial and the eschatological Paradise, and the mention of it in any context is intended immediately to conjure up in the reader's mind the entire span of salvation history, thus admirably emphasizing, for example, the place of each individual Christian's Baptism within the divine economy as a whole" (p. 67). One could say that Saint Ephrem is concerned with the elevation of the body to the level of the soul; the soul to the level of the spirit; and the spirit to the level of God's majesty, as indeed Saint Ephrem does say in Hymn 8.21.

Certainly *Hymns on Paradise* has a theological vision that is as fresh today as it was when it was originally written and a poetic appeal that is timeless.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Fasting in the Orthodox Church: Its Theological, Pastoral, and Social Implications.* By Archimandrite Akakios. Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1990. Pp. 107. \$6.50, soft.

The issue of fasting in the contemporary Orthodox Church has become a confused one, and it is a very positive sign that we have Constantine Cavarinos' *Fasting and Science* (translated and edited by Bishop Chrysostomos in 1988), originally published in Athens in Greek in 1988 as *Nesteia kai Episteme*, and now Archimandrite Akakios' *Fasting in the Orthodox Church* as handy resources that can be used by laity and clergy alike.

The archimandrite has produced a notably clear and authoritative study of the subject in four very closely packed chapters entitled

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Malherbe as is possible at this time but with the caution that some articles and book reviews may be missing.

*Greeks, Romans, and Christians* is an international effort honoring an internationally recognized scholar who continues to contribute to our better understanding of the interaction between Greco-Roman culture and Christianity and who has inspired a significant number of other Western scholars to do likewise. It is, to be sure, a Western Christian effort that needs to be examined critically by Eastern Christian scholars as well. Though there will be differences in interpretation, the effort is meant to provide us with a fuller understanding of the world in which early Christianity developed.

*John E. Rexine*  
Colgate University

*Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology.* By Constantine N. Tsirpanlis. Theology and Life Series 30. A Michael Glazier Book. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991. Pp. viii + 277. \$16.95, soft.

Introductory texts and general surveys on any subject are much more difficult to write than books on single, specified topics. The writer must be able to draw on a vast array of original and secondary sources and his/her own ingenuity to provide the reader with an authoritative yet clearly understandable and pedagogically ordered text. Dr. Constantine Tsirpanlis, who teaches Church History, Patristics, and Orthodox Theology at Unification Theological Seminary in Barrytown, New York and is President and Founder of the American Institute for Patristic and Byzantine Studies and Editor of its *Patristic and Byzantine Review*, has capitalized on his fourteen years of continuous teaching in these areas to publish his lectures and notes, not to replace any available manual or handbook of patrology, nor as "a descriptive analysis of patristic writings, that is, but a thematic interpretative study of patristic thought; a clear, concise, and objective presentation of the views of the Greek Fathers on Creation (Cosmology), Anthropology-Mariology, Christology-Soteriology, Pneumatology-Ecclesiology-Hagiology-Asceticism, and Eschatology" (p. 17). The book is consequently divided into the aforementioned five major topical sections. The audience at which

the book is aimed are seminary students who already have a foundation or core course in early Church History (and so detailed information about the writings of the Fathers who belong to the three major patristic periods is left out, i.e., the periods 100-300, 300-430, 430-900), and no biographies of the Fathers are included for the same reason.

The book has certain special features that will be pedagogically useful for students and teachers alike. First, it has a glossary of terms at the beginning (pp. 1-15) of the volume (which would better have been placed at the end). For some curious reason, the printer has printed grave accents wherever accents are used over transliterated words and the transliteration of Greek words is wholly inconsistent, sometimes using the traditional Classical transliteration of Greek words, sometimes using an unscientific phonetic system that tries to reproduce the sounds of modern Greek. Second, at the end of each section (or should we say "lesson"?) there follow a series of questions for discussion and review and a select bibliography for further reading that is brief and reasonable. Third, there is an appendix with "A Patristic Reading Program"—English translations of the Fathers in series, in selection, and in individual Fathers. In addition, the volume contains the usual list of abbreviations, Preface, endnotes, and index.

*Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* is rightly built on the assumption that any theological instruction without the patristic experience is defective and incomplete. Dr. Tsirpanlis notes that "Study of the patristic writings, furthermore, provides an experience in uniting heart and mind in theology" (p. 19) and because the "Fathers were passionately committed to divine things (theology) and deeply preoccupied with the question of salvation primarily" they had in this a principle of unity, that is, personal salvation (Ibid.).

Professor Tsirpanlis indicates that there are four criteria for determining who a Father is, namely, (1) orthodoxy of doctrine; (2) holiness of life; (3) ecclesiastical approval; and (4) antiquity. Generally, patrology is divided into (1) the origins of patristic literature (first, second, third centuries); (2) the Golden Age of patristic literature (300-430); and (3) the Later Centuries (430-893).

It is obviously not possible in a limited review to do full justice to the richness and importance of the material presented in this volume. Each section has its own distinct contribution to make, and does so with a fullness and straightforwardness that challenges the



reader to probe further and study more deeply.

Author Tsirpanlis points out that in Greek patristic thought "there is *no* opposition between freedom ('likeness') and grace (God's image in man); the presence in man of divine qualities, of a 'grace' (God's image) which makes him fully man, 'neither destroys his freedom, nor limits the necessity for him to become fully himself by his own effort; rather, it secures that cooperation, or *synergy*, between the divine will and human choice which makes possible the progress 'from glory to glory' and the assimilation of man to the divine dignity for which he was created" (p. 46). God showed His enormous love for humankind through the Incarnation which "was indeed a sovereign act of God, but it was a revelation not only of His omnipotent might, but above all of His Fatherly love and compassion. There was implied an appeal to human freedom once more, as an appeal to freedom was implied in the act of creation of rational beings. The initiative was, of course, Divine. Yet, as the means of salvation chosen by God was to be an assumption of true human nature by a Divine Person, man had to have his active share in the mystery" (p. 55). Appropriately, Tsirpanlis cites Saint Athanasius who repeatedly stresses that our *Theosis* (deification) is the very purpose of the Incarnation: "The great theologian of Alexandria profoundly explains how human nature was divinized by an intimate contact with the Logos through the Incarnation" (p. 67). Dr. Tsirpanlis points out that though the early Church Fathers did not aim at forming and maintaining a sacramental system or defining the number of sacraments, they did intend "to emphasize the mysterious, inexpressible and divine character of Christian faith and man's salvation by the grace of God through visible ecclesiastical celebrations also surpassing reason and understanding" (p. 140), which gives him the opportunity to discuss repentance-confession, priesthood-ordination, marriage and holy unction, after a major discussion of baptism, confirmation-Chrism, and the Eucharist. The Church is described as receiving its authenticity from the Spirit and "the conscious and personal experience of the Holy Spirit is the supreme goal of Christian life in the Byzantine tradition—a call to 'perfection' and to 'holiness' and not a propositional system of ethics nor a puritanical moralism" (p. 89). Saints are the manifestations of the positive results of Christianity; "they are exceptionally 'deified' members of the mystical Body of Christ . . . However, the saints' 'deified bodies' are not 'deified' by divine nature, but by grace or *uncreated energeia* which is not identifiable with God's essence, i.e.,

of Christ's divine nature or *ousia*" (p. 150).

A most important feature of Patristic theology is the stress laid on human will and humankind's ultimate ability to bring the gnostic (human) will into harmony with Christ's accomplishment and redirect human action toward God because "Real freedom only exists when man's free will is united with God's will . . . This conformity constitutes the true freedom and complete humanity" (pp. 79-80). The Holy Spirit becomes the most essential synthesis of history and eschatology, Dr. Tsirpanlis points out, a synthesis of the present and the future of the Kingdom of God. As a result, "This synthesis precisely restores the ontological unity, harmony and fulfillment of the entire cosmos and transforms physical death into immortality. Of course, the initiator, the Paradigm, and the leader of such a synthesis and transformation is Christ, the Logos of creation and its recreator, "Who is the *Eschaton*, historical 'telos,' the *pleroma* of God's Kingdom" (p. 185).

Constantine Tsirpanlis' volume is itself a marvelous synthesis of patristic theology, despite certain mechanical infelicities like the pervasive butchering of the Greek texts (in Greek) that are cited (wrong positions for accents and breathings, wrong letters printed), misspellings (like "annointed" and "enterprize," "George" instead of "Georges" for Father Florovsky's first name), the failure to provide English translations for many Greek words, including entire passages that are cited (Are we to presume that all seminary students can readily read Patristic Greek—not likely in this day and age!), and a number of cases of unidiomatic English. These infelicities could have been avoided with more prudent editing.

All in all, *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* very much does what it sets out to do and does it efficiently and effectively. It both introduces interested readers to the Greek Church Fathers and to Orthodox theology, and challenges them to absorb this Christian Tradition, and opens new and rich vistas for them that will make Christian history and theology more meaningful and authentic.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## John Chrysostom's Greek Classical Education and its Importance to Us Today

---

DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS

SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM HAS BEEN RIGHTLY PRAISED BY A VARIETY of scholars. One scholar writes that Chrysostom was "one of the great Greek Fathers"; another one adds that Chrysostom was "one of the great personalities of the Christian Church and humankind in general"; a third specialist describes him as "one of the three great ecumenical teachers of the Greek Church"; a fourth expert comments that Chrysostom is "the most prolific and influential Church Father"; and a fifth authority concludes that Chrysostom represents "the best thought and temper of the Church" in the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>1</sup>

Some others, both ancient and modern, have praised specific qualities of the saint. Isidoros Pelousiotis (360-440), Chrysostom's contemporary and a great Church Father in his own right, acclaimed Chrysostom as the "all-wiseman," the "wise prophet of God's mysteries," "the eyes of the Church in Byzantium and the Church everywhere" (ὁ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπορρήτων σοφὸς ὑποφήτης Ἰωάννης, ὁ τῆς ἐν Βυζαντίῳ Ἐκκλησίας καὶ πάσης ὀφθαλμός).

---

<sup>1</sup>The present essay is a slightly revised text of an address delivered on February 6, 1991, before the faculty, students and guests of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, when the Institution bestowed upon the author the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

<sup>1</sup>For representative scholarly opinion on Chrysostom, see: Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Westminster, MD, 1960), 3, pp. 424-82; Demetrios S. Mpalanos, *Οἱ Πατέρες καὶ Συγγραφεῖς τῆς Ἀρχαίας Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, 1949), pp. 91-106; K. I. Amantos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Βυζαντινοῦ Κράτους*, 2 vols. (Athens, 1953-1957), 1, pp. 79-88; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols. (New York, 1958), 1, pp. 138-60; Chrysostomus Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time*, 2 vols. (London, 1957); I. Karayannopoulos, *Ἱστορία Βυζαντινοῦ Κράτους*, 2 vols. (Thessalonike, 1978-1981), 1, pp. 214-28.

Isidoros applauded the Attic qualities of Chrysostom's language, the purity of his discourse, his natural thought, his style, his superb imagination and figures of speech — all qualities of a person excellently educated in the Greek classics. In a rhetorical hyperbole, Isidoros adds that Chrysostom's Attic qualities surpassed those of Plutarch, Gorgias, and even Plato.<sup>2</sup> In a letter addressed to a certain Herakleios, Isidoros writes that the beauty of Chrysostom's writings was already well known to all educated people from corner to corner of the earth and the sea. He adds that John's language is music which tames wild beasts and human beings, and makes wolves cohabit with lambs. "Take Chrysostom's lyre and the lethargic in you will start dancing to his articulate music" is Isidoros' advice.

Chrysostom's Greek classical education has also been highly acclaimed by leading classical philologists of recent years. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, one of the great philologists and Hellenists of all times asserts that Chrysostom's writing is "the harmonious expression of an Attic soul."<sup>3</sup> But what do these writers mean by "Attic qualities" and "Attic soul?" We shall discuss this question later in our essay. For the moment let me underline that today there is unanimity among Christian (Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Protestant) and non-Christian scholars about the importance of Chrysostom for history, and also for church and society.

Nevertheless we do not know much about the celebrated saint. We do not even know the exact year of his birth. Was it in 345, 347, 354, or what? The only period of his life and ministry, including his trial, exile, and death, for which we have reliable information, is between the year of his elevation to the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople in 398 and the year of his death in 407. Palladios, the long standing authority of the saint's biography, is silent on several major questions. Modern scholars are reassessing Chrysostom's life in the light of the writings by Martyrios, Patriarch of Antioch (459-470) and George, Patriarch of Alexandria (621-630), whose biographies have been found reliable.<sup>4</sup> But long before modern students returned to the Antiochian Martyrios and George Alexandrinos, Photios, the great

<sup>2</sup> Isidoros Pelusiotis, *Epistles*, Bk. 1, no. 156; Bk. 2, no. 42 in PG 78.288B; 484B-D; 1217C-1320A.

<sup>3</sup> Ulrich von Willamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (Berlin, 1905), p. 296.

<sup>4</sup> Florent van Ommeslaeghe, "Que vaut le Témoignage de Pallade sur le Procès de saint Jean Chrysostom?" *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 95 (1977) 389-414.

ninth century scholar and patriarch, whose memory we honor today, had read and extracted the biography of Chrysostom by George of Alexandria.

Sometime before his departure with a group of other dignitaries for an ambassadorial visit to the court of the Caliph at Samara in 845, Patriarch Photios compiled his literary memoirs, summaries of books and notes read either with his students or by himself. In one of them he writes:

I read the work of George, bishop of Alexandria, entitled *The Life of John the Chrysostom*. Who the author is, I cannot state with certainty. . . . The author says that he has compiled his history from material taken from bishop Palladios, who has written an admirable and careful life of Chrysostom in the form of a dialogue, from Socrates, and other writers.<sup>5</sup>

We know about Palladios, the bishop of Elenopolis, who was well trained in the Greek classics, and Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, but who are the other anonymous writers? We do not know, but apparently they provide important information on Chrysostom's classical education omitted by Palladios.

Photios accepts the validity of Chrysostom's biography by George of Alexandria with some critical reservations. He writes that George "appears to relate much that is contrary to the truth of history, but there is nothing to prevent the reader from picking out what is useful and passing over the rest." I follow Photios' advice and I accept the information of George according to which Chrysostom received an excellent Greek classical education not only in Antioch but also in Athens. At Antioch Chrysostom studied Greek literature, grammar, and rhetoric under the sophist Libanios, philosophy under Andragathios, and theology under Diodore of Tarsus.

After Antioch, Chrysostom, like Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, Libanios, Julian, and every ambitious fourth century young man, pursued advanced studies in Athens where presumably he stayed for several years. Athens was still the most important center for philosophical and literary learning. While in Athens, Chrysostom

---

<sup>5</sup> Photios, *Bibliotheca*, no. 96. Trans. J. H. Freese, *The Library of Photios* (London, 1920), 1, pp. 177-78.

impressed greatly several non-Christian Greeks such as Anthemios, the priest of the temple of Athena on the Acropolis, reputed as the wisest man of Athens, and Demosthenes, the prefect of the city. We are told that Chrysostom's learning and eloquence, as well as his piety and prayers, contributed to the conversion of Anthemios who received baptism along with all the members of his family. His example was imitated by many non-Christian Athenians.<sup>6</sup>

It was Chrysostom's quality education in "thyrathen, secular, paideia," liberal humanities as well as in "hiera grammata," the Holy Scriptures; his persuasive eloquence and his sincere piety and convictions, his Attic mind and his Christian soul, that influenced his pagan audience to turn to Christianity.

But is this historical truth or invented tradition? Because Palladios is silent about Chrysostom's studies in Athens, some scholars reject George Alexandrinos' information that Chrysostom had indeed spent some years in Athens. They advanced the theory that because it seemed incomprehensible to Byzantine hagiologists that Chrysostom "the greatest orator of the Christian Church had not been in Athens," still the most important center of learning, they invented the story. It found its way in later Byzantine hagiology including the writings of Photios and Symeon Metaphrastes. Symeon Metaphrastes relates that when Chrysostom had enjoyed to the outmost his education in Athens, he was overwhelmed by nostalgia for his mother and country and decided to return to Antioch, resisting the plea of the Athenians who wanted him to become their bishop.<sup>7</sup>

But why did Paladios neglect to write something about Chrysostom's studies in Athens and say more about his classical education? Why did Chrysostom himself make disparaging remarks against some classical luminaries including Plato?

The fourth and the fifth centuries were critical for the consolidation, codification and propagation of Christianity. Paganism was still very much alive and antagonistic to Christianity. Some major non-Christian intellectuals, such as Themistios, Libanios, Julian, Ammianos Markellinos, Hypatia, defended old beliefs and practices. There were many Christian scholars and Church Fathers who had been educated

<sup>6</sup>P. R. Norton, "The Vita S. Chrysostomi by Georgius Alexandrinus," *Classical Philology*, vol. 20 (1925), p. 70.

<sup>7</sup>Symeon Metaphrastes, "Bios kai Politeia . . . tou Chrysostomou," PG 114.1049D-53C; Photios, *Bibliotheca*, no. 96.

in the pagan tradition, the Greek classics in particular. The strong reaction of some of them against paganism was an expression of their desire to avoid any identification with its culture.

Unlike hagiologists of the later Byzantine centuries, such as George Acropolites for example, who embellished their lives of saints with scriptural verses and an equal number of passages from classical authors, hagiologists of the early Byzantine centuries such as Palladios, Kyrillos Skythopolites, Ioannes Moschos, systematically avoided referring to the classical background of some of their heroes. The reason is obvious. In the early centuries of Christianity the classical heritage presented a threat while in the later centuries it was the established faith and for that very reason many later Church Fathers felt not only secure to use freely but also to initiate the revival of the Greek heritage.

Whatever the explanation may be, it is certain that Chrysostom's mind had been trained not only in Holy Scripture but from the earliest days of his life he had been diligently educated in the Greek humanistic classics. He had read carefully and exhaustively all the important literature of the ancient Greeks-poetry, history, and philosophy.

It was customary even for less well known church fathers to study Greek authors. Socrates, the fifth century ecclesiastical historian relates that Attikos, Chrysostom's successor, was such a person. "Being intent, if an opportunity offered itself anywhere, he [Attikos] exercised himself in the most approved Greek authors."<sup>8</sup> Others contributed much more to the symbiosis of Greek learning and Christian scriptures. Apolinarios the presbyter of Laodicea as a grammarian "composed a grammar consistent with the Christian faith. He also translated the Book of Moses into heroic verse and all the historical books of the Old Testament, putting them partly into dactylic measure, and partly reducing them to the form of dramatic tragedy." Socrates adds that Apolinarios "purposely employed all kinds of verse, that no form of expression peculiar to the Greek language might be unknown or unheard of among Christians."<sup>9</sup>

Apolinarios the younger, too, placed his Greek education to the service of the Christians. He was a rhetorician and excellently trained in the classics. As bishop of Laodicea, he "expounded the Gospels

<sup>8</sup> Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, 7.27.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. 3.16.



and apostolic doctrines in the way of dialogue, as Plato among the Greeks had done." Summarizing the attitude of Church Fathers toward the Greek classics, Socrates adds:

"Greek literature certainly was never recognized either by Christ or his Apostles as divinely inspired, nor on the other hand was it wholly rejected as pernicious. And this they did, I conceive, not without serious thought. For there were many philosophers among the Greeks who were not far from the knowledge of God; . . . for these reasons they have become useful to all lovers of real piety."<sup>10</sup>

Socrates emphasized that the Fathers followed the example of Saint Paul who "not only does not forbid our being instructed in Greek learning, but that he himself seems by no means to have neglected it, inasmuch as he knows many of the sayings of the Greeks." Socrates questioned the need to elaborate on the subject because "it is well known that in ancient times the Fathers of the Church by unhindered usage were accustomed to exercise themselves in the learning of the Greeks, until they had reached an advanced age: this they did with a view to improve themselves in eloquence and to strengthen and polish their mind, and at the same time to enable them to refute the errors of the pagans" he adds.<sup>11</sup>

It was because of their great learning in the Greek humanities that enemies of Christianity such as Julian resented Christian intellectuals including Apolinarios, Basil the Great, Gregory the theologian, and others.<sup>12</sup>

The fourth century Greek Fathers did not condemn Greek philosophy and the human urge to philosophise and think critically because the tradition had been established by some major Christian theologians of the pre-Constantinian era. Clement of Alexandria had taught that "philosophy is the clear image of truth, a gift of God to the Greeks"; it can be used to demonstrate not refute the faith. God gave the Law to the Hebrews but philosophy to the Greeks which can serve as a paidagogos leading to Christ"<sup>13</sup> the Logos. And the

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Sozomenos, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.18.

<sup>13</sup>Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1.1, 20.1.

great Origen used the strength and vigour of Greek philosophical insight to establish the principle that Christianity is not irrational, a religion only for the simple-minded.

In the great debates between Hellenism and Christianity in the early Church, some Church Fathers, including Chrysostom, condemned only methods of philosophising, and pseudo-philosophies which engaged in theories without practical results. They were interested in the actual salvation of the human being and any philosophy which cannot transfer it to its source of origin was considered in error. The great debate between Hellenism, its ideology and principles, and Christianity itself continues to our own time because many of its consequences have relevance to contemporary theological dialogues. But let us return to Chrysostom's relationship with Hellenism.

Whether in terms of style, form, or ideas Chrysostom's background in the Greek heritage was both broad and influential on his ministry and writings. And he did not acquire it only in the four walls of a classroom, or the dusty libraries of his teachers. His whole native city was an open university of Greek classical civilization.

Antioch had a gymnasium which offered intellectual stimulation and provided an all embracing education through observation and active temples and sacred altars; the statues of gods, goddesses, semi-gods and heroes; the great state and city library called the museum; the theater on the slope of the Acropolis, the stadium where the Olympics were held.<sup>14</sup> All these and more provided opportunities for cultural enrichment and gave Chrysostom a sense of continuity with his heritage, pagan, nonetheless his own. Chrysostomus Baur, one of Chrysostom's most authoritative modern scholars, writes that during Chrysostom's life time "between Greek classicism and Greek Christianity the most intimate relations existed."<sup>15</sup> Such was the dominance of Greek linguistic literary and philosophical culture in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire that very few Church Fathers and literary persons became interested in learning any other language except Greek. Chrysostom never learned Hebrew, Latin, or Syrian which he called "a barbarous language."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup>The best book on Antioch, the city and its civilization, is Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, 1961). There are two other shorter versions of the same work.

<sup>15</sup>Baur, Chrysostom, 1, p. 9.

<sup>16</sup>Ioannou Chrysostomou, "Eis martyras; Omilia 2, 1, ed. Speros Moustakas in *Ioannou Chrysostomou Apanta ta Erga*, vol. 36 (Thessalonike, 1983), p. 580. Cf. Baur.

Chrysostom was born and raised in a city which boasted of itself as the "Syriades Athenai" (Syrian Athens). "Not only in blood did Antioch think of itself as an offshoot of Athens, but all the religious and intellectual activity of the city was a continuation and reaffirmation of the achievement of classical Greece. In its worship of the old gods, in its study of classical literature, history, and philosophy, in its rich artistic activity, in its local counterpart of the famous Olympic Games of Greece, Antioch could justly and proudly claim that it endeavored to live in the great tradition of ancient Hellas"<sup>17</sup> to quote my teacher Dr. Glanville Downey, who participated in Antioch's excavations between 1932-1939 and remains the outstanding authority on Antioch.

In his monumental volume *Ancient Antioch*, Downey writes: "Antioch had a special mission, first in transplanting Greek culture into Semitic Syria in the wake of the conquests of Alexander the Great, then as a vigorous Christian center in which Christianity and the Greek tradition were in time harmonized to form the new Christian Hellenic tradition which in turn was brought to a new fruition in Constantine the Great's new foundation, Constantinople, which as the center of Byzantine culture preserved the Greek Christian heritage for transmission to the West at the Renaissance."<sup>18</sup>

It was in this "Athens of the East," that Chrysostom acquired his "Attic soul." His success as a preacher is attributed not only to an excellent knowledge of the Christian Scriptures and his homiletical charisma but also to his broad Greek rhetorical and classical learning. The critical and transitional early Byzantine centuries (330-565) provided the climate and the means which contributed to the formation of the Greek Christian civilization which, however, was built on the living substance of the old pagan Greek civilization. Greek and Christian were not antithetical terms. Thus "a Christian could still be proud of being a Greek" in the words of Glanville Downey.<sup>19</sup> The spiritual and intellectual force of Byzantine civilization, its integrity and inner strength, was the synthesis of the new vitality of the Greek intellectual achievement and the power of the Christian gospel. It

---

Chrysostom, 1, 24.

<sup>17</sup>Glanville Downey, *Ancient Antioch* (Princeton, 1963), pp. 4-5. This is a condensation of Downey's *History of Antioch* cited above.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.* p. 275.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*

was this Greek Christian heritage that shaped the strength and the backbone of the Byzantine Empire enabling it to resist the assaults of so many enemies, old and new (the Persians, Arabs, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Huns, Bulgars, Slavs, Russians, Patzinaks, Magyars, Turks, Franks) for nearly one thousand years.

Thus Chrysostom was brought up in an intellectual, social, and political climate, of a city where both elements, the Greek and the Christian co-existed with a special intensity and strength. Their symbiosis became the rule rather than the exception. Whether directly or indirectly Chrysostom contributed to their interdependence.

Nevertheless, Chrysostom's greatness lies not so much in the form and style of his writings but in the content and the essence of his message; in the variety and timelessness of his subjects. His essays and sermons are "a rich treasure house" for ordinary folk, theologians, philologists, social historians, even archaeologists. In many of his ideas he is as contemporary as any. It is for this reason that Chrysostom has earned the respect, admiration and affection of all centuries. He is frequently cited not so much for doctrinal theology as for ethics, behavior, piety, social relationships. His passionate denunciations of social inequality, of the rich and heartles, the gluttony, avarice, and luxury of laymen and clergymen alike have the same import and value for today and tomorrow. He remained a source for the enrichment of sermons and essays throughout the Byzantine centuries. Saint Photios, for example in his *Amphilochia* and *Epistles* refers to the mind and views of Chrysostom more than 65 times.<sup>20</sup>

Like the Cappadocian Fathers, and long before them the Apologists, the Alexandrians and other Church Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, Chrysostom assigned Greek Classical thought below Holy Scripture. The Fathers were fully aware of their benefit of learning which synthesizes the biblical truth with the inherited intellectual culture. "The fruit of the soul is preeminently truth, yet to clothe it with external wisdom is not without merit, giving a kind of foliage and covering for the fruit and an aspect by no means unbecoming" writes Basil the Great.<sup>21</sup>

As already indicated, Chrysostom's study of the Bible was extensive

<sup>20</sup>Photios, *Amphilochia* and *Epistles*, ed. by B. Laourdas and L.G. Westerink, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1983-1987). My account is based on the information in vol. 6.2.

<sup>21</sup>Basil of Caesarea, "Pros tous Neous," 2. ed. B. Psautogias in the series *Basileiou tou Megalou Apanta ta Erga*, 10 vols. (Thessalonike, 1972-1974), 7,332.

and exceptionally profound. He is reported to have known by heart the whole Bible and that you can reconstruct it on the basis of the passages with which he embellished his homilies and other writings. It is also true that Chrysostom appears as a critic of Greek philosophers like Plato whom he compared unfavorably with Saint Paul. He attacked the philosophy of others as pseudo-wisdom. But in spite of some disparaging remarks about the classical heritage Chrysostom was only superficially against it.<sup>22</sup>

The influence of his classical education is evident in many of his writings. For example, his essay *On the Priesthood* is cast in a Platonic dialogue pattern and has been described "as a literary device in classical form." On the other hand, the concept of the Greek polis as an organism, where the citizen lives out his individuality, exerted a tremendous influence on Chrysostom. In his homilies *On the Statues*, he appealed to the Antiochians' pride as citizens of a distinguished polis; he reminded them of the city's glorious history and of the duty to prove themselves worthy. He emphasized that the greatness of a city lies in the virtues of its citizens. "This is in the pure Hellenic tradition" in the words of Dr. Downey.

From Justin the philosopher and martyr, through Clement of Alexandria and the Cappadocians, consistent efforts were made to achieve the spiritual symbiosis between classical Greek ideas and the Christian ideology. Several major Church Fathers considered it their task to graft a "wild alive tree," every ancient good Greek idea, into a Christian idea. They tried to transform human *philosophia* into divine *theognosia* to paraphrase Theodore Dukas Laskaris, the 13th century philosopher-theologian, Emperor of Nicaea.<sup>23</sup>

In this sense Chrysostom followed a well established *paradosis*. When someone tried to prevent them from studying the classics because of their commitment to Christianity they protested, claiming that no one had the right to deprive them of what was their own patrimony.

When, for example, in the middle of the fourth century Emperor Julian issued laws (362-363) forbidding Christian teachers to teach Greek classics, Church Fathers reacted against Julian's policies. They

<sup>22</sup>Cf. August Neander, *The Life of St. Chrysostom*, tr. by J.C. Stapelton (London, 1838), pp. 5-8.

<sup>23</sup>Theodore Dukas Laskaris, *Christianikes Theologias Logoi*, no. 5.4, ed. Christos Th. Krikonis, *Theodorou B. Laskareos Peri Christianikes Theologias Logoi* (Thessalonike, 1988), pp. 110-11.

felt themselves unjustly excluded from their own Hellenic heritage. Gregory the Theologian questioned the emperor's law by saying: "Who gave you the right to deprive us of speaking and teaching Greek (to hellenizein) and who told you that Greek is your own patrimony and not ours as well?" Gregory was totally versed in Greek literary and philosophical heritage, including mythology. In his defense against Julian, he uses many Greek rhetorical devices to compare the accomplishments of Christians with those of pagans.<sup>24</sup>

In his essay *The Blessed Babylos and Against the Pagans* (Hellenes), John Chrysostom condemns pagan religion but not the Greek cultural inheritance. "Chrysostom is faithful to traditional Greek ethical theory," in the words of one of Chrysostom's special scholars.<sup>25</sup> He uses the principles of Greek ethical theory in order to demonstrate that the Hellenic idea of virtue is realized only among Christians. In his apologetic discourse on the *Blessed Babylos* Chrysostom reveals his debt to Hellenism, and his views about Hellenic ideas.

First, his essay is constructed in the best rules of classical learning. Second, his narrative about the achievements of Babylos in life and after death correspond to the elements used to eulogize the hero in Greek literature. Veneration of the hero in life and in death, the reward of virtue during life and after death; honor paid to the public person; the sacredness (hagiotes) of the good person in life and in death are common in the Homeric epics and later in Plato and other Greek masters.

The most important of the Church Fathers respected the religious quest of the ancient Greeks whose search came to converge in the teaching of Herakleitos on "universal logos," the "ultimate living mind or Divine intelligence" of Anaxagoras — teachings which led to the belief of Socrates and Plato that there is "a provident and benevolent maker and father of the universe."<sup>26</sup> Chrysostom, along with other Greek Fathers educated in the Greek classics, appreciated the ancient belief that virtue is the health of the soul. Virtue is the perfection of the divine intelligence that the human person shares

<sup>24</sup>Gregory the Theologian, "Logos kata Ioulianou, 1, 101-105, ed. P. Papaevangelou, in the series *Gregorion Theologou Apanta to Erga*, 6 vols. (Thessalonike, 1975-1977), 3, 144-54.

<sup>25</sup>Margaret A. Schatkin and Paul W. Harkins, translators, *Saint John Chrysostom Apologist* (Washington, D. C., 1983), p. 42.

<sup>26</sup>F. M. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought* (New York, 1969), pp. xxi-xxv.

with the divinity. The duty of every human being is to "follow God" and thus "become immortal." The human soul, though fallen and tainted by association with its bodily prison-house, is of divine origin and able to regain divinity or immortality.

There are several more outstanding values of ancient Hellenism both philosophical and ethical which were compatible with Christianity. Christian intellectuals and many Church Fathers realized, for example, that the knowledge of the Divinity's nature and inner life was the first and primary goal of the Hellenic wise person. The acquisition of divine language and the possession of criteria to judge the validity of this knowledge convinced the ancient Greeks that there is no conflict and no contradiction between the divine source of wisdom (apocalypsis-revelation), and the human quest for divine wisdom (logos-reason). These two sources of wisdom converge and complement one another.

It is in the light of this background that no major Church Father or ecclesiastical writer ever raised the Tertullian question "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" Since the divine exists in the human (for in the divinity "we live and move and have our being" as Aratos and Epimenides said and Paul of Tarsus confirmed, Acts 17.28), reason is a God-given gift. Thus divine revelation and human reason originate from the same source.

One of the principal talents of the Greeks was their natural disposition for the religious mysteries and theological truths. They were philosophers and seekers after truth. They believed that the rule of law, freedom itself, have religious foundations. By instinct and through intuition, search and observation, they arrived in the belief of the divine origins of human kind and of the cosmos. With a few exceptions, such as Protagoras and Isocrates, Greek thinkers never believed in secular humanism, that the human being is the measure of all things, and that pure reason could dethrone the divine from its uncreated and all pervasive presence. It is for this reason that modern scholars are against the de-Hellenization of Christianity. They acknowledge that on the whole the adoption of Hellenic thought, categories, language, ethical principles was beneficial to Christianity. Thus they advocate the re-Hellenization rather than its de-Hellenization.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup>A. H. Armstrong, "On Not Knowing too Much about God," in *Hellenic and Christian Studies*, 15, (Brookfield, VT, 1990), p. 131.

Sophocles, in the *Oedipus Tyrannos*, makes central this very point. When Creon and Iocaste ridiculed Teiresias the prophet, placing queen reason over the law of heaven, they were reminded that they will not escape divine punishment because the law of heaven originates with the divinity and not in the nature of the human person. And in his *Antigone*, Sophocles emphasized the eternal immutability of divine law which cannot be violated by any human pretensions to power.

Greek ethics were especially valued by the Christian Fathers for they were ecumenical in nature. *Philoxenia, philanthropia, isonomia, timocratia* — hospitality, philanthropy, equality under the law, meritocracy. Just a few observations on *philoxenia-philanthropia*, highly admired and pursued by the ancient Greeks from as early as the Homeric age. One of the best illustrations of the Greek concern for the human person in need is related by Homer who has been part of Greek education throughout the centuries.

In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus finds himself in a strange land and wondered to what land of mortals fate had delivered him: "Are these people proud and savage and without justice, or are they friendly to strangers and have a god-fearing mind?" He had landed on the island of Phaeakians (Kerkyra?) and at the beach he was discovered by Nausica and her servants. What followed is an illustration of ancient Greek religious humanism.

This man, a wretched wanderer, has come here whom we must look after, for all strangers and beggars are in the care of Zeus, and a gift, no matter how small, it should be given glandly. Come girls, give food and drink to the stranger, wash him in the river where is a shelter against the wind. So Nausica said, and they stood and vied with each other and they took Odysseus down to a shelter, as Nausica . . . had ordered. They put down a mantle and a tunic and clothes for him, and gave him liquid olive oil in a golden flash . . .<sup>28</sup>

Elsewhere we read that when Athena in the guise of a stranger, the Taphian leader Mentos, visited Odysseus' house in Ithaca, Telemachos rushed to the stranger and said: "Welcome stranger, our home is your home. When you have eaten dinner, you will tell us

<sup>28</sup>Homer, *The Odyssey*, Bk. 6:180-184.



what it is you need." And when Nestor, king of Pylos and his sons saw Telemachos and his companions, they ran toward them to welcome, and asked them to sit down for a meal. "No one will go away from my house without necessary help. . .," and "so long as children are left to me. . .to entertain strangers (xenos) whoever comes to my house" said Nestor. The same tradition existed in other parts of the Greek world. For example when Menelaos the king of Lacedaimon saw the two strangers coming to him, he welcomed them and urged them "to take some food and enjoy themselves:" adding that "when you have partaken of dinner, we shall ask what kind of men you are."<sup>29</sup>

Philoxenia, hospitality to strangers, reveals the ethos and the ethical disposition, the characteristic and distinguishing attitudes, habits and customs of a person or a people and in this sense Greek ethical thought was not exclusive in practice but in its application it embraced any human being. At no time do we find ethics among the Greeks which excluded non-Greeks from humanitarian treatment. Their chief god Zeus provided the example. Among other attributes he was a Xenios Zeus, a lover of all strangers, needy and destitute. "He protects pious suppliants and he is a friend and the protector of strangers and his grace follows them wherever they go." "Open to any one who knocks on your door" was the divine commandment.<sup>30</sup> When compared to ethical philanthropic concerns and activities of other ancient peoples, Greek ethical theory has been found broader in scope and more encompassing in practice. In its benevolent attitude towards the strangers, the elderly, orphans, and wayfarers, Greek society clearly achieved pre-eminence. In comparing Hebrew and Greek attitudes toward hospitality, W.C. Firebaugh an authority on the subject, writes:

One phase of hospitality there was, in the Heroic Age, which placed it far above the standards practiced by the Hebrews, at least in the later ages of their history and the only examples which can be cited to compare with their Greek standard are those of Abraham and Lot. To the Greek, it made not the slightest difference whether his guest was a Dorian or an Ionian, a Locrian, a Corcyrian, or an Attican, it made no difference whether he was even of Greek stock, he was entitled

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

to food and shelter, and also to protection while under his host's roof. The Hebrew, in the later period of his history, while always hospitable, confined his charity and entertainment to members of his own race, or to those closely allied to it. The unlimited scope of Hellenic hospitality will be better understood after a thorough perusal of Homer, the gospel of the ancient Greeks."<sup>31</sup>

The Jewish people regarded themselves as the exclusive people of God, a belief that involved the rejection of all other people. "The Lord is merciful and gracious" but "he is only gracious to Israelites; other nations he will terrify." "If a man repents God accepts him, but that applies only to Israel and no other nation." Jewish exclusiveness had influenced every aspect of daily life. An Israelite was forbidden to do business with a Gentile and he must not go on a journey with a Gentile; an Israelite must neither give hospitality to, nor accept hospitality from a Gentile; or compare Socrates's ethical principle that "it is evil to retaliate evil for evil" with Deuteronomy's advice: "you shall have no pity, an eye for an eye, a tooth for tooth, a life for a life."<sup>32</sup>

It is in the light of this background that Church Fathers did not reject Greek ethics. Ultimately Christian ethics came to be viewed closer to the Hellenic than the Hebrew mind. Some Greek perceptions about family life were received as very noble. For example when Odysseus sought the assistance of Nausica he addressed her as follows:

May the gods grant you as much as your heart desires; may they give you a husband and also a home, filled up with love. *For there is nothing more beautiful and noble than husband and wife in love taking care of their household with one mind, man and woman, two bodies with one soul a pain to their enemies and a joy to their friends.*<sup>33</sup>

The Greek Fathers rejected belief in polytheism but adopted many aspects of the Greek religious life. The attitude of the average Greek toward the divine was expressed most directly in liturgy, ritual, observance, in prayers and hymns of the temple service. To be sure religious

<sup>31</sup>W.C. Firebaugh, *The Inns of Greece and Rome* (Chicago, 1928; New York, 1972), pp. 29-30.

<sup>32</sup>Plato, *Cratylus*, 49.c; 54.c.; Deut 19.21.

<sup>33</sup>Homer, *The Odyssey*, Bk. 6:180-184.

thought was never absent from literary products such as poetry, history, philosophy of the ancient Greeks. Indeed as St. Paul had observed in Athens the Greeks were very religious (Acts 17.22). Whether of the Greek Orthodox Christian tradition or the Latin Western, practicing Christian or not, people educated in Western Civilization have been nourished on a tradition that rests on Hebrew monotheism reformed by Jesus Christ and Paul of Tarsus, combined with a metaphysical theology derived from Herakleitos, Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle; and the ritual, symbolism, mysticism and the element of mystery from ancient Greek and Hellenistic inheritance.

Chrysostom's liturgical language "theognosias akeraton fos"; "philanthropos Theos"; "anenchon kai akatakriton tin parastasin tou hagiou sou thysiasteriou"; the "aphaton kai ametreton sou philanthropian"; "atreptos kai analoiotos gegonas anthropos" these and many more ideas and theological expressions remind us of Chrysostom's debt to the Greek religious and philosophical background. Chrysostom was not an original systematic theologian. Even in his catechetical orations he presents no profound theology. But his writings are a rich reservoir for social history; liturgy and liturgical life; church customs and social conditions which made his moral concerns achieve original expression. Through his homilies on wealth, poverty, charity, philanthropy, Chrysostom raised the level of personal and social conscience and emphasized the importance of conscience as the innate voice of God.

There is in Chrysostom's writings much for all of us: theologians and theological students, clergy and lay people alike. In addition to purely theological reasons for studying Chrysostom, like the other great Fathers of the early and medieval Church, in his own characteristic way Chrysostom shows the results of the interaction of Christianity and Hellenism. His classical education, his use of Attic Greek language and style, his thorough knowledge of the Holy Scriptures remind us of what real theological training should be.

One of the most important objects we learn from a study of Chrysostom's writings is that he was a person of strong moral principles, profound personal faith, and a sincere commitment to improving the lot of the less fortunate members of society. Less interested in controversial theological issues, he was a champion of practical ethics. Whether in Antioch or in Constantinople, Chrysostom's aim was the moral reformation of Church and Society. He spared the sinner but he was merciless against sin. He attacked the ostentatious

luxury of the wealthy classes as well as the sensuality, gluttony and avarice of women of the imperial court, the clergy higher and lower alike — monks, nuns, and deaconesses. Chrysostom became “as a torch burning before sore eyes” in the words of Palladios.<sup>34</sup> As priest and bishop Chrysostom was described as “very charitable, so that many called him the Eleemon-Almsgiver.”<sup>35</sup>

By modern philosophical standards, Chrysostom was a liberal because he was concerned with liberal values — freedom of the oppressed, eradication of inequality and suffering, elimination of social injustice. As a priest in Antioch and Patriarch in Constantinople he attacked luxury and pretension, extravagance and ostententious display of power and wealth. He was the champion of simplicity, sincerity, openness and virtue. He did not separate the values of his public from his private life. One of the major lessons we learn from his life and ministry is that there is no theological or ideological way that would justify a separation of our private from our public life; our private religious convictions from our public ministry and testimony.

Among other contributions to Christianity, Chrysostom is credited with successful missions among the Kelts, Scythians, Phoenicians, and Marcionites. In Christian worship he introduced new prayers and liturgical practices. For example, increasing the number of nightly services with chanting. As an administrator, he expelled at least 12 bishops for Simoniac reasons. Accepting fees for consecration was regarded as the most serious sin for a bishop.

There are several other aspects of Chrysostom's life, education, and teachings which are significant for us today. His views on the priesthood, on education, on wealth and poverty, and several more ecclesiastical and theological issues. Here we can only touch upon what he has to teach us about theological education and priestly formation. Only his training in the Scriptures was superior to his Greek classical education. Today more than ever, in an age of high technology and the physical sciences, we need to place more emphasis on the classical humanities as a preparation for theology and pastoral ministry. Not too long ago Vatican issued a special encyclical asking

<sup>34</sup>Palladios, “Life of St. John Chrysostom,” ed. P.R. Coleman, Norton, *Palladii Dialogue de vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi* (Cambridge, 1928).

<sup>35</sup>Quasten, *Patrology*, 3, p. 454. For Chrysostom's concern for eleemosyne see my book *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, 2nd ed., ch. 5, esp. pp. 57-60.

Roman Catholic seminaries to bring back Greek and Latin as indispensable tools in a well rounded theological education. Secular and non-Christian humanists<sup>36</sup> decry the loss of traditional values which go back to classical humanities. The Greek classics are reproducible and relevant to all times for they speak endlessly of morals and virtue, and the universality and the sacredness of the human being. Whether pre-Socratic, Socratic, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurian thought, Pagan Hellenism and Christian Hellenism have much in common. If some people are not aware of this symbiosis, it is because our theological training (yours and mine) has been terribly deficient in the study of classical humanities. Whether because of historical circumstances, an overloaded curriculum, or prejudice and bias, theological education has been narrow. It was not so with the Fathers, including Chrysostom.

Fourth and fifth century champions of pagan Hellenism such as Libanios, Themistios, and Julian, and critics such as Epiphanius of Cyprus, Cyril of Alexandria and to some degree Chrysostom, agreed that Hellenism and Christianity shared many similarities in the realm of both religion and ethics. In the debates between Christian Hellenists and Pagan Hellenists the following agreements become evident:

1) All authentic wisdom consists in the correct understanding of the divine and human reality as far as the human being is capable to comprehend.

2) The correct understanding can be acquired through contemplation of the Divine Reality and the practice of virtue.

3) True contemplation and genuine practice of virtue derive from imitation of and communion with the divinity.

4) Imitation and communion with the divinity reveals the transcendental qualities of unity, truth, goodness and beauty of the divinity as they are reflected in the life of the virtuous and wise person.

5) The duty of the individual who has achieved this state of being is to communicate his experience to his fellow human beings.

6) The first responsibility of the wise person is to practice piety — *eusebeia* and then imitate the divinity in a life of purity

<sup>36</sup>Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York, 1987), esp. pp. 380-82.

and service to humanity. The relationship of love for God and neighbor through the practice of piety, philanthropy, justice and moderation (metron, diacrisis) brings inner freedom and genuine life.

7) The goal of the wise human being in both Hellenism and Christianity is happiness on earth and salvation which is identified with life in the Divinity (theosis).

8) Divinely revealed truth was not the prerogative of Hebrews and Christians. The Greeks claimed to have received their own truths from the Divinity directly through their philosophers and prophets.

9) Both Hellenism and Christianity affirm that the unique source of all true wisdom is the divinity which reveals it in diverse manners and various ways: the external created cosmos with its harmony and beauty, and the inner world of the human person's moral and spiritual life. The divine will is communicated in the legacy wise men whether philosophers or prophets and apostles of the past have left behind.

10) The last of this comprehensive synopsis is the belief that the human being came from God, or the divinity, and its vocation is to seek communion with the divine through worship and imitation.<sup>37</sup>

Respect and honor for John Chrysostom, the Cappadocians, Photios and the whole patristic tradition means imitation of their learning and attitude toward their cultural and intellectual background and priestly formation. A theology which concentrates on easy learning, including biblical fundamentalism, utility, and short cuts in historical learning is a shallow, a pseudo-theology. Greek Orthodox theology in particular cannot subscribe to the Tertullian myopia and religious romanticism and seek to divert itself from its sources and long standing classical humanistic heritage. Only imperfect knowledge of genuine Hellenic thought leads to bias, prejudice and polemics. The educated Christian Fathers saw much good in Sophokles'

<sup>37</sup>William J. Malley, S.J. *Hellenism and Christianity* (Rome, 1978), pp. 418-20. What Malley says about similarities between Hellenic and Christian wisdom in persons and writings of Julian and Cyril of Alexandria who "had roots in the same cultural heritage" can be expanded to include the mind of Pagan and Christian Hellenism in general.

*Antigone*, Plato's *Dialogues*, and Aristotle's *Ethics* — to mention only a few of Greek classical antiquity's heritage. Their ethical teachings are reproducible in any place and all times.

Saint John Chrysostom's Greek classical education reminds us that a modern theologian priest or bishop should be excellently trained in the classical humanities in order to better understand Christianity, its cultural background and its intellectual inheritance.

To be sure our theology should be studied and understood in terms of its basic scripture (the Bible); its theological and canonical expression as it was formulated by Ecumenical Synods and the patristic mind (Sacred Tradition); but also in its historical experience (the *Praxis*) and cultural milieu; the experience of the living Community of believers at any given time and place in history.

All three aspects were the theoretical and practical concern of Chrysostom and other major Church Fathers. They relied on the Scriptures but they also borrowed heavily from Greek thought which dominated the intellectual environment of their time, especially Neoplatonism and Stoicism. These two philosophical systems in particular concerned themselves with the dignity of the human being, the doctrine of the human soul, social ethics and metaphysics — all topics of modern concern. Moreover, the Fathers were fully aware of historical realities which shaped the daily life of their people. In a sense theirs was a holistic approach to the problematics of the human being.

Orthodox theology possesses strong rootedness and it has inherited a living tradition which, however, calls constantly for a re-evaluation but also a re-baptism in the theological language and symbolism, rationalism but also mystical sensibilities, psychological insights and creative spirituality, historical experience and contemporary realities. The past both Christian and non-Christian is internal in the life of our people. Chrysostom's Greek classical heritage is part of our own heritage. A study of history reveals that in every culture and ideology there are certain constants and irreducible ideological components. Our classical heritage includes several such components.

Moreover, students of theology should always remember that St. John Chrysostom received a liberal education, studying Greek language, history, literature, and philosophy for the sake of a more successful ministry of the Gospel (exeskethe tois logois pros diakonian ton theion logon — writes his biographer Palladios.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup>Palladios, *Dialogos*, 5. In contrast to H. Moore, the translator, and P. R. Cole-

No wonder why after some disastrous experiments in recent years, many seminaries are reintroducing to their curricula the basics, including Greek and Latin languages and humanities.

Can we afford to do less in our theological education?

---

man-Norton, the editor of the *Dialogos*, A. H. M. Jones believes that the phrase "diakonia ton theion logon" means that Chrysostom was preparing for civil service rather than the priesthood. See A. H. M. Jones, "St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education," *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953) 171-73.



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The translation of “οὐκ ἀδιάφορος” should be as “not unlike” to show that the energy proceeds from the essence and both are uncreated.

The present volume of the thought of Saint Gregory Palamas makes it available to a large audience in the Western world. We are therefore in Professor Sinkweicz’s debt for this significant contribution to the better understanding of the thought of a great theologian of considerable stature and influence on Orthodox theology.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

*Liturgical Literacy: from Anamnesis to Worship.* By Dennis C. Smolar-ski, S. J. Mahway, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 216. \$10.95, soft.

In today’s world, effective communication often paves the way for a proper understanding of other people, their ideas and thoughts, their beliefs, and their condition within a given context. Refusal to communicate with others may make an individual socially mute, dumb, and unrelational—closed off, as it were, from new ideas and from communally sharing those ideas. *To not be able* to communicate is one thing; *to not want* to relate with others though provokes a self-alienation which may ultimately lead to a fatal separation from God, from the rest of humanity, and from oneself. Humankind, created in God’s own “image and likeness” (Gen 1.26), was bestowed the gift of intelligible language, the means by which one relates to both the Lord and other human beings.

When one common language is spoken and understood by persons belonging to various groups—social, political, or religious—there may be agreement on certain issues raised in discussion. Needless to say, there may also continue to be disagreement, confusion, and uncertainty between group members. However, in speaking a common tongue, people learn about each other and “grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ” (2 Pt 3.18). They grow in love and respect for one another. Although this mutual understanding between persons may not always be enough to resolve differences of opinion and belief in today’s pluralistic, secular society, speaking a common language certainly creates a firm basis upon which to build towards a possible unity between the

different groups.

Fr. Dennis C. Smolarski's book *Liturgical Literacy* attempts to do just what was stated above: to lay the groundwork for a common liturgical language between the various Christian Churches which enjoy the benefit of liturgical worship. His central purpose does not lie in proving that the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, for example, must unite on the basis of common liturgical rites and practices. On the contrary, his main objective is to familiarize his reader, despite his religious affiliation (Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant), with the various liturgical names, dates, objects, and actions that are commonly found in each of the three major traditions of Christianity. For Fr. Smolarski, *liturgical literacy* is defined as "the ability to read about and intelligently discuss the community's public adoration of God" (p. 1), a discussion to be conducted "with a respect for and knowledge of history, scripture, tradition, and human nature" (p. 1). His hope is that his readers' "understanding of the nature of contemporary worship may be improved if we make use of the various forms of human communication available to us, . . . and if we expand our vocabulary and our understanding of the words and objects we use in worship" (p.1). Again, a common language makes way for worthwhile, intelligible, and productive dialogue: *liturgical literacy*, on the other hand, creates poor verbal interaction between the different worshipping traditions and can easily promote unfair misconceptions and biases between people that separate and wound rather than unite and heal.

In Chapter 1, entitled "Liturgical Literacy," Fr. Smolarski argues that unless Christians of differing backgrounds maintain a common language, a common *liturgical literacy* about their past, their chances to build a future advocating inter-faith union are very slim, if not impossible. *Awareness* of each other's existing traditions, rites, actions, objects, and history comprises the first critical stage toward reunion of the Churches. He writes, "To renew our Church, and have it renew the world, we must know what we are talking about, and know the various allusions to Scripture, liturgical traditions, and the customs of various peoples" (p. 5). Hence, such strong convictions have motivated Fr. Smolarski to compile this book, containing lists of "over 650 terms old and new, popular and scholarly" (p. 8), helpful in the study of Christian liturgics.

Chapter 2 ("From Anamnesis to Worship") offers a few thoughts on a liturgical flow common to every Christian liturgical tradition:

from *anamnesis* ("the remembrance of Jesus Christ's salvific work on earth, especially the institution of the Holy Eucharist") to *worship* ("an 'active' remembrance, or *anamnesis*, of the paschal mystery—humanity's salvation through Christ's death and resurrection"). As these two terms are located alphabetically towards the beginning and end of the book's dictionary, they similarly commence and terminate the flow of all Christian liturgical worship. By remembering God's salvific work of love through Jesus Christ, a Christian unites this past event to the present and transforms it into a potent present reality which impacts heavily upon his life through worship. Fr. Dennis writes, "*From anamnesis to worship*—that is the flow of Christian life. We remember and we celebrate. We remember what God has done, and we worship the God who acts" (p. 13).

In Chapter 3, entitled "From Thanksgiving Back to Epiclesis," Fr. Smolarski simply states that all liturgical worship follows a cycle involving *thanksgiving* for all of God's blessings and *epiclesis*, the "calling upon" God to sanctify his people through the invocation of the Holy Spirit. This pattern, common in the prayers for the dedication of the Temple in Jerusalem by Solomon (see 1 Kgs 8 and 2 Chr 6), also occurs at every liturgical celebration of the people of God, in both Eastern and Western Christianity.

Chapter 4 ("From Past to Future") points out how our past shapes our future. Concerning liturgical language, Fr. Smolarski observes, "We need to know what a word meant to early Christians, and what that same word should mean to Christians of the coming millennium. All this involves liturgical literacy" (p. 19). A student of liturgy needs to be able to locate a certain term regarding worship within its proper context, understand its meaning in that context, and apply the term in an appropriate contemporary liturgical setting. Thus, liturgical literacy involves the placement of liturgical words, actions, etc. in their original context, in order for them to be comprehended more fully and carefully. A word such as *anaphora*, for example, may have a slightly variable connotation today then it had in the first or second century, A. D. Nonetheless, this book's purpose, to reiterate, is not to suggest a definitive means of unity between the three major Christian Churches on the basis of a common liturgical literacy. Rather, the intent is to focus on liturgical worship, to familiarize each Christian with his fellow Christian's liturgical tradition, and to provide an accurate and firm basis upon which inter-faith dialogue of a sacramental/liturgical nature may continue between Eastern Ortho-

dox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant Christians.

Chapter 5 ("Overview"), 6 ("Foundations: List 1"), 7 ("Contemporary Fluency: List 2"), and 8 ("Historical and Technical Proficiency: List 3") basically introduce the lists of selected liturgical terms, split up into three different groupings and defined separately and fully in Chapter 9 ("The Dictionary"). These three lists, appearing in a hierarchical order, exist for a purpose: they allow the reader to place himself in the list which his knowledge or interest allots, letting him progress from one list to the other at his own pace. List 1 ("Foundations") consists of 100 core terms which Fr. Smolarski feels constitute the basic vocabulary on which a concrete knowledge of present-day liturgy can be built. Words such as "Amen," "Easter," "Lord's Prayer," and "priest" are included in this list. List 2 ("Contemporary Fluency") consists of those additional terms which ought to be known by one who wishes to delve into a deeper study of the varying Christian liturgical traditions. This list includes terms such as "Apostles' Creed," "chasuble," "Kyrie," and "Pascha." In conclusion, the third list ("Historical and Technical Proficiency") consists of terms to be known in order to appreciate scholarly—though popular—articles on liturgical questions, questions prone to incite much discussion and argumentation. Among the words in this list are "epitrachelion," "economy," "Paul VI, Pope," and "synergy."

Chapter 9 ("The Dictionary"), which makes up the bulk of *Liturgical Literacy*, lists alphabetically (in capitals and bold-faced type) each term as it appears in the previous three chapters, or word lists. Immediately after each term, a number of parentheses makes reference to the word list in which the word appears. If a particular word within the definition of a term appears in bold-face type, this signifies that the word itself is pertinent and should be looked up for further reference and clarification. A self-reference and any other important concepts related to the term are noted in italics. Finally, at the end of the book, Fr. Smolarski includes an extensive and helpful bibliography of liturgical literature which he apparently consulted to compose *Liturgical Literacy*. Although the majority of sources mentioned are predominantly Roman Catholic, he includes a few Orthodox works, such as Fr. Alexander Schmemmann's *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom* and *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*.

All in all, Fr. Smolarski's *Liturgical Literacy* is an excellent, well organized, and helpful reference aid in the study of Christian liturgics. For a book of just over 200 pages, his work contains a wide selection

of liturgical terms which the reader will, no doubt, wish to explore. He could have included a wider array of terms (no one can deny the vast plethora of existing Christian terminology!); however, the word lists found in this book have been appropriately arranged to represent the liturgical tradition of which they are a part. Another positive aspect of this book lies in the simplicity of the definitions provided. Each definition, brief or long, is simple to understand, concise, and clear. Finally, the book, I feel, succeeds in its purpose of effecting a mutual understanding and respect among Christians of different liturgical backgrounds.

A few criticisms about the book must also be brought to attention. First, it appears as though the bibliography, as used by Fr. Smolarski, relies more heavily on Roman Catholic resources instead of giving equal weight to Orthodox or even Protestant material. This is evident by the inclusion of only two Orthodox authors in the bibliography. Although a Catholic reference book may have been used to define an Orthodox term, an Orthodox book used as a reference would give a better and clearer explanation of the word. For example, the word "epitrachelion" (the stole worn by Eastern Orthodox clergymen) is defined simply for what it is and for what it looks like; the author does not talk about its symbolism, something surely to be touched upon by an Orthodox work of reference. Another criticism to be made about Fr. Smolarski's book revolves around a sometimes careless and perhaps biased definition of terms, in which one can easily notice a Western interpretation and influence. For example, the date "1054" is defined as the traditional date of the Great Schism, which "separated the Orthodox east *from* the Catholic west" and which "isolated the Byzantine style of liturgical rites from the Roman style" (p. 49). Many Orthodox historians and theologians alike would respond that this definition is unfair, claiming that the Orthodox Church is the original Church of Christ, and it was the West which separated from the East. Even such an assessment may appear unfair to Catholics and so, perhaps a safer, as well as accurate, definition, may be: "The traditional year of the Great Schism, in which the Christian Church became divided, with the Western churches taking the name "Roman Catholic" and the Eastern churches "Eastern Orthodox." In such a work which obviously attempts to foster a mutual understanding and respect among the various Christian liturgical traditions, it is vital to provide accurate information in a careful and unbiased way, using as many Christian references as possible.

In all, though, Fr. Dennis Smolarski's book *Liturgical Literacy* is an excellent study of Christian liturgical terminology. The book is not only a large credit to its author, it is also an indispensable reference manual for all students of Christian liturgy and for the Church at large as she prepares to enter into her second millennium of existence.

*Stelyio Muksuris*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.



of Nazianzos, St. Basil, and St. John Chrysostom) and the Seven Ecumenical Synods (325, 381, 431, 451, 553, 680, 787), the Iconoclastic struggle (726-843), the greatest of all patriarchs Photios (857-867, 878-886), the so-called "Schism of 1054" (Michael Keroularios patriarch), the attempts at Reunion (Lyon 1274, Florence 1439), the Patriarchates of Jeremiah II of the 16th century, to the greatest Orthodox Patriarch of modern times, Athenagoras, whose attempts at reconciliation and ecumenical relations with other Christian churches are now legendary.

Deno Geanakoplos shows what the Ecumenical Patriarchate has contributed over two millenia and how it has "managed, as it must, to carry on its mission of leadership over the Orthodox Churches of the world, including the Orthodox Church of America which is directly under patriarchal jurisdiction" with all of the world's Orthodox regarding it as "the first among equals" (pp. 26-27).

*A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (330-1990)* is an indispensable guide for all Orthodox Christians and for all those who wish to understand the Orthodox Church in proper historical perspective.

*John Rexine*  
Colgate University

*Ἡ Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἀντιπαράθεσις Ἑλλήνων καὶ Λατίνων . . . 858-1439* [The Ecclesiastical Diversification of the Greeks and the Latins . . . 858-1439]. By Methodios G. Fouyas. Athens, 1990. Pp. 501. Paper.

This major volume should be of interest to scholars, historians, and theologians alike interested in the relations between the mediaeval Greek East and the Latin West. In addition to its intrinsic value as a scholarly historical and theological study of various stages in the relations between the two halves of mediaeval Christendom, it should appeal to modern ecumenists engaged in theological dialogues and inter-faith relations.

Furthermore the present book is more than a theological analysis and historical account of events that took place between the ninth and the fifteenth century of our era; it is an anatomy of the psyche of two related but also different people, who shared a common faith

for nearly eight hundred years. As such it is a balanced and objective study, written in a serious and agonizing ecumenical spirit.

Following an illuminating introduction of some ten pages, the volume is divided into five parts and forty-two chapters. The first part reviews the place of the Christian Church in the two halves of the Roman Empire—the Greek East and the Latin West. The chapters “Two Worlds—One Church,” “The Synodic System of the Church,” and the “Pentarchy of the Patriarchs” are of particular interest to those in Christian dialogues. Differences between the two worlds of Christendom are traced back to the fifth century. The author discerns the need for a rediscovery of the Pentarchy in its apostolic significance and advocates the convocation of an ecumenical council between the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches to resolve the dividing theological issues.

The issues of the period under discussion can be summarized in four: the papal claims for supremacy of authority (the Christian East always accorded primacy of honor to the Patriarch or Pope of the West); the theological problem of the *filioque* addition to the Nicæan-Constantinopolitan creed; the *azyma* (unleavened bread in the Eucharist); and the purgatorium.

Notwithstanding theological and ecclesiastical differences, one may add that some of the misunderstandings can be traced back to the attitudes of the Roman West toward the Greek East and vice-versa. From as early as the 2nd century B. C., the Roman West looked down upon the Greek East from a position of political power while the Greek East looked down upon the Latin West from a position of intellectual power. The Greeks never forgot Horatius’ pronouncement “that captive Greece took its captor captive and introduced to the rustic Latins the arts.” And the Latins never forgot Cato’s and Cicero’s acknowledgement that the Romans received much-too-much from the Greeks but that they were better than their benefactors.

The Christian Church, nurtured in the Greek and Roman world, inherited not only the thought-world but also the attitudes prevailing in the Roman Empire. This leads Dr. Fouyas to stress that the Greek Christian East cared more for the spiritual presence of the Church in the world, while the Latin Christian West concerned itself more with organizational structure, centralization of authority, even political power, especially after the collapse of Roman imperial rule following the conquest of the West by the barbarians. While the Christian East emphasized the importance of the Pentarchy and the Synodic

system as the seat of supreme authority in the Church, the Christian West sought to establish an ecclesiastical monarchy. In Rome's attitude toward the East the author discerns principles of the inheritance from pagan Rome and the Roman Empire.

Throughout the book, the author points out similarities and dissimilarities between the two worlds of Christendom—in terms of theology, ecclesiastical polity, and political theory and practice. He is objective and critical of attitudes by both Greeks and Latins, Popes and Patriarchs. He quotes the sources extensively and reproduces letters and documents to illustrate various points of interpretation.

In brief, the present volume, the *magnum opus* of Dr. Fouyas' writings, is a well-researched and thought-out study of contemporary significance. As an interpretive thesis, it is bound to encounter opposite points of view. Some of the author's positions may be challenged by Western theologians. Nevertheless the author raises serious questions which will stimulate reconsiderations of theological stances in both camps and lead to dialogues. This in itself is no mean accomplishment.

*Demetrios J. Constantelos*  
Stockton State College

*Saint Gregory Nazianzen: Selected Poems.* Translated with an Introduction by John McGuckin. Oxford: Sisters of Love of God Press, 1989. Pp. xx + 24, soft.

The fourth century of the Christian era, known as the golden age of Christianity, includes the contribution of the great father and patriarch of Constantinople Gregory the Theologian, who was one of the most eloquent men of his time and a great defender of Orthodoxy.

In this work, Dr. McGuckin presents an excellent introduction to the life and thought of Saint Gregory. He contextualizes the person and theology. The author begins with a brief biography, that is, the place and time of his birth and education under the best Christian and pagan teachers of philosophy and rhetoric. In addition the author gives us a clear picture of Gregory's travels, his devotion to his father, his loyalty to friendships, his ministry to the Church, and especially his literary achievements. Included is a clear, but brief exposition of his method of theologizing and the theology of the Church.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Male Domination of Woman in the Writings of Saint John Chrysostom

---

VALERIE KARRAS

THE BYZANTINE CHURCH FATHERS HAVE NEVER BEEN ACCUSED OF being feminists, and John Chrysostom is no exception. In fact, his comments in such works as *On Virginity* and *On One Marriage* regarding the proper role for woman within society and the life of her family have often been considered at the least very traditional, and in modern terms quite sexist. However, despite the works of such persons as Elizabeth Clark (*Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends*), no one seems to have undertaken the task of examining methodically his ontological views on woman or her fundamental relationship to man. These views can be garnered from the earlier-mentioned works as well as from, in particular, his homilies on Genesis and on 1 Corinthians. Is he really a theological sexist who hypocritically valued close relationships with female friends?

I would like to summarize Chrysostom's views on the ontological nature of woman. It is worth prefacing this by noting that Chrysostom does not seem to believe that gender will exist in the resurrection.<sup>1</sup> However, Chrysostom, one of the most pragmatic and pastorally-minded Church Fathers, generally deals with humanity as it *does* exist now, and his anthropological views are based on the creation narrative in Genesis.

Genesis 1.26-27 is one of the bases for his views on woman vis-à-vis the image of God. This is from the first creation account, by the so-called Priestly redactors:

<sup>1</sup>*On Matthew*, Hom. 70, 3, PG 58.658.

Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them (Gen 1.27).

Chrysostom interprets these verses in an inclusive sense. He consistently affirms that woman shares with man all the traits of God's image. These include virtue, free will (which in the prelapsarian state meant freedom from all passions or other necessities as well)<sup>2</sup> and dominion over the created world.<sup>3</sup>

But there is a second creation account, part of the so-called Yahwist tradition.

Then the Lord God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him. . . ." So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. . . ." (Gen 2.18, 21-23).

This account, which chronicles the creation of Eve from the side of Adam, is used by Chrysostom for what I call his "derivative" theory of the image of God in woman, which I will discuss shortly. However, he also uses it to emphasize that woman is *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμογενής* to man. God has not made a new creation in woman. Rather, he has simply constructed another human being — hence, the use of the word *οἰκοδομῶ*. Adam needed someone with whom to converse (*προσ-διαλέγομαι*), with whom to share, someone who could provide him with human communion, and woman met that need perfectly.<sup>4</sup>

But what is Chrysostom's opinion on the fundamental nature of the relationship between man and woman? And specifically, how

<sup>2</sup> *On Genesis*, Hom. 15 and 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Hom. 10, PG 53.84-85.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* Hom. 15, 3, PG 53.121-22.

does he treat the issue of male domination of woman? 1 Corinthians 11 has often been used to support the notion that there is a natural domination of woman by man. The key Pauline verses are as follows:

But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God. . . . [Man] is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man. (For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man.). . . (Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.) (1 Cor 11.3, 7-9, 11-12).

Paul's words in 1 Corinthians obviously refer to Genesis 2.21-22, cited earlier, but with a different connotation. Woman is the glory of man because she was made for and from him. Chrysostom in his homilies on 1 Corinthians, treats this issue at length. He speaks of man and woman each exhibiting the symbols appropriate to their respective states of domination and subjection.<sup>5</sup> Woman errs when she transgresses the proper order since going beyond the limits and laws ordained by God diminishes her.<sup>6</sup> He even asserts that male domination is "natural" and seems to boast of male superiority:

"But the woman is the glory of the man." Therefore the rule of the man is natural. . . . This is again a second superiority, nay, rather also a third, and a fourth, the first being, that Christ is the head of us, and we of the woman; a second, that we are the glory of God, but the woman of us; a third, that we are not of the woman but she of us; a fourth, that we are not for her, but she for us.<sup>7</sup>

But what kind of "rule" does Chrysostom understand in this context, specifically in terms of his affirming Paul's view that woman

<sup>5</sup> Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, Hom. 26, 3-4, PG 61.216-18.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 4, col. 217.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. col. 218. English translation in John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*. Oxford trans., rev. and annot. by Talbot W. Chambers. "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. 12 (Grand Rapids, 1969) repr., p. 153.

is the glory of man? Elizabeth Clark<sup>8</sup> interprets Chrysostom's comments in this respect as evidence that he does not believe woman truly to reflect God's image.<sup>9</sup> And George Tavad, like Clark, interprets Chrysostom as believing that God's "image in man resides in his power, analogous to God's dominion over all,"<sup>10</sup> a power which woman presumably does not share. But, as mentioned earlier, Chrysostom grants woman full participation in God's image, and he explicitly grants the power of dominion to woman in his 10th Homily on Genesis.<sup>11</sup>

How then are we to understand Chrysostom? Man and woman are equally made according to the image of God. However, as Theodoros Zissis suggests,<sup>12</sup> Chrysostom's view of their ontological relationship to each other is based on 1 Corinthians 11.3 and 11.7, i.e., it reflects the relationship between the Father and the Son as expressed in Colossians 1.15.<sup>13</sup> It is important to remember that in Greek patristic theology the trinitarian relationship is considered to be "hierarchical." Thus, reference is made to the "monarchy of the Father" without implying any submission or denigration of the Son or the Holy Spirit. It simply refers to the ontological relationship among the three persons of the Trinity, an analogy which Chrysostom applies to the relationship between man and woman. In other words, as the Son is begotten of the Father, so woman is derived from man. Chrysostom declares this quite explicitly when, in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11.3, he explains that one must understand "head" in terms of cause or origin (*κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον*):

For had Paul meant to speak of rule and subjection, as thou

<sup>8</sup> Elizabeth A. Clark, *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends: Essays and Translations* (New York, 1979), pp. 5-6 and 24-25, n. 29.

<sup>9</sup> Clark, p. 6, and George H. Tavad, *Woman in Christian Tradition* (Notre Dame, 1973), p. 86, try to separate Chrysostom's use of such terms as *ὁμοούσιος* and *αὐτῆ μορφή* from his concept of image, rather than recognizing the dual nature he ascribes to the term itself.

<sup>10</sup> Tavad, p. 86.

<sup>11</sup> Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 10, 3-4, PG 53:85 and Hom. 17, 8. So Theodoros Zissis, *Ἄνθρωπος καὶ κόσμος ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Χρυσόστομον*, Ἀναλῆκτα Βλατάδων 9 (Thessalonike, 1971), p. 79, notes: "Ἐν τῇ ἀρχηγίᾳ καταστάσει ἡ γυνὴ εἶναι ὁμότιμος πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα, μετέχουσα τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἀρχῆς καὶ ἀποτελοῦσα οὐ μόνον ἀπαραίτητον βοήθην τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ ὂν."

<sup>12</sup> Zissis, p. 80.

<sup>13</sup> "[Christ], who is the image of the invisible God . . ."



sayest, he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and master. For what if the wife be under subjection to us? it is as a wife, as free, as equal in honor. And the Son also, though he did become obedient to the Father, it was as the Son of God, it was as God.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, Chrysostom's "derivative" theory of the image based on 1 Corinthians establishes a preeminence of honor for the man but does not support an ontological male domination. Chrysostom, however, obviously believes that there is male domination in the present order of human society. He even finds positive aspects to this. Interestingly, he applies monarchist political theory to the question of submission.<sup>15</sup> Woman is subjected to man since "equality provokes fighting."<sup>16</sup> Certainly, democracy for the Byzantines was synonymous with anarchy. He also feels that man would have resented woman's role in the Fall and so caused warfare between the sexes.<sup>17</sup> Man's domination of woman therefore presumably subverts this tendency and preserves peace and unity between the sexes.

Zissis shares this view, but he applies it even to the initial relationship between man and woman,<sup>18</sup> a view which Chrysostom's writings do not support. For example, in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11, Chrysostom quite clearly recognizes that male domination was not part of the initial order:

Wherefore you see, she was not subjected as soon as she was made; nor, when He brought her to the man, did either she hear any such thing from God, nor did the man say any such word to her: he said indeed that she was "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh:" (Gen. 2.23) but of rule or subjection he no where made mention to her.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup>Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, 26,2, PG 61.214-15; NPNF 12, p. 150. Clark, p. 2, appears to miss this point completely.

<sup>15</sup>See Clark, pp. 1-2.

<sup>16</sup>Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, Hom. 26, 2(3), PG 61.215: "ἡ γὰρ ἰσοτιμία μάχην ποιεῖ." Zissis, for example, regarding man's postlapsarian domination of woman, asserts (p. 181) that "[β]ασιλικῶς προφυλάσσει αὐτὴ [ἡ ἐξουσία] ἐκ τοῦ χάους τῆς ἀναρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀκυβερνησίας. Ἐπειδὴ τὸ ὁμότιμον εἰσάγει μάχας, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς διήρθρωσε κατὰ τοιοῦτον τρόπον τὴν κοινωνίαν."

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. See Zissis, p. 143.

<sup>18</sup>Zissis, pp. 79-80: "Ἡ ὁμοτιμία αὐτὴ δὲν σημαίνει τὴν εἰς τὰς μεταξὺ αὐτῶν σχέσεις ἑλλειψιν ἀρχῆς τινοῦ καὶ ἱεραρχήσεως, διότι ἡ ἑλλειψις ἀρχῆς καταστρέφει τὴν ἐνότητα."

<sup>19</sup>Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, Hom. 26,2 (3), PG 61.215; NPNF 12, pp. 150-51.

When, then, does Chrysostom believe male domination to have begun and what is its nature? We must return to his homilies on Genesis to understand Chrysostom's theory of cause and effect. He asserts that man rules and woman submits, but ties it not only to Genesis 2 and 1 Corinthians, but to Genesis 3.16: "yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you."<sup>20</sup> This last verse concerns the results of Eve's disobedience to God. Chrysostom, faithful to the Genesis account, views male domination as a component of the postlapsarian human condition.<sup>21</sup> It is woman's punishment for leading man from God.<sup>22</sup> Thus, because woman abused her equality, she is now relegated to a new subordination, "natural" within the fallen state of Man.<sup>23</sup>

Zissis interprets Chrysostom as condemning Eve not simply for leading Adam astray, but for attempting to dominate him.<sup>24</sup> Applying Chrysostom's analogy of the male-female relationship to the head and body, Zissis asserts that Eve transgressed the bounds of her proper nature by leading Adam rather than following him.<sup>25</sup> And indeed, Chrysostom accuses Adam of reversing the proper order, of allowing the body to lead the head by following Eve rather than correcting her.<sup>26</sup> Yet it is because he has reversed the order and

<sup>20</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 8, 4, PG 53.73 and 26, 2, 215.

<sup>21</sup>For the opposite view, see Clark, pp. 4-6, and Zissis, pp. 80-81. The latter claims that Chrysostom "δέχεται την βάσει της δημιουργίας υποταγήν της γυναικός εις τον άνδρα" άπλώς τονίζει περισσότερο το και εις τον Παύλον άπαντων στοιχείον της εξ αίτίας της άμαρτίας επιτάσεως της δουλείας της γυναικός."

<sup>22</sup>Tavard, p. 17, sees this as an actual "reversal of the order of the universe achieved in Eden [where] woman in innocence was the acme of creation."

<sup>23</sup>Tavard, p. 89, and Bernard Grillet (in Chrysostom, *On Virginity*, "Introduction Générale," *Sources Chrétiennes* no. 125, p. 59, n. 2) agree that Chrysostom sees male domination of woman as a postlapsarian condition. Also see S. Verosta, *Johannes Chrysostomus als Staatsphilosoph und Geschichtstheologe* (Graz-Vienna-Cologne, 1960) whom Zissis cites, p. 80, regarding his view that female submission is "sekundares Naturrecht" according to Chrysostom.

<sup>24</sup>Zissis, p. 80.

<sup>25</sup>Zissis, p. 177.

<sup>26</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17,4, PG 53.139: "Κεφαλή γάρ ει της γυναικός, και διά σι εκείνη παρήχθη· σὺ δὲ την τάξιν άνέστρεφας, και οὐ μόνον εκείνην οὐ διώρθωσας, αλλά και συγκατεσπάσθης και δέον τὸ λοιπὸν σώμα τῇ κεφαλῇ ἑπείσθαι, τὸ ἐναντίον γέγονε, και ἡ κεφαλή τῷ λοιπῷ σώματι ἐξηκολούθησε, και τὰ ἄνω κάτω γέγονε. Διὰ τοῦτο, ἐπειδὴ την τάξιν ἄπασαν άνέστρεφας, ἐν τούτοις ει νῦν, ὁ πρὸ τούτου τσαούτη δόξῃ περιβεβλημένος." Elsewhere, however, Chrysostom uses the body and head analogy to refer to male-female relations *after* the fall (ibid. 9): "ποῖαν ἂν τις ἀπολογίαν σχοίη λέγων, ὅτι διά την γυναῖκα τὸ και τὸ ἥμαρτον, και τὸ ἔκπραξα; Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ και ὑπὸ

followed Eve's human, erroneous counsel over God's command, as he makes clear in numerous places.<sup>27</sup> Chrysostom grants the propriety of Adam's listening to Eve, who is his wife and *ὁμογενής* to him, but he condemns Adam's following Eve instead of God.<sup>28</sup> Consequently, he warns men not to follow women's bad advice and warns women not to give bad advice.<sup>29</sup> He does not, however, forbid women to counsel men or men to accept that counsel as a general rule.

Thus, Chrysostom's emphasis is on Eve's *misuse* of her power and equality. He amplifies this idea in his homilies both on Genesis 3.16 and on 1 Corinthians 11, claiming that woman lost her initial equality to man because she misused her power by leading him astray.<sup>30</sup> He also strengthens the element of personal responsibility by noting that she herself forsook her equal partner for a creature — the serpent — who was inferior to her and under her domination.<sup>31</sup>

---

τὴν δεσποτείαν γέγονε τὴν σὴν, καὶ κύριος αὐτῆς ἀπεφάνθη, ἵνα ἐκείνη σοι κατακολουθεῖ καὶ μὴ ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῖς ποσὶν ἔπηται.”

<sup>27</sup>See, e.g., Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17, 4 and 9.

<sup>28</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, 16, 4, PG 53.130: “Πολλὴ καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡ ραθυμία. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὁμογενὴς ἦν, καὶ γυνὴ ἦν, ἀλλ’ ἐχρῆν ἑναυλον ἔχοντα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐντολὴν, προτιμωτέραν ταύτην ποιήσασθαι τῆς ἀκαίρου ἐπιθυμίας ἐκείνης, καὶ μὴ κοινωνῆσαι τῆς παραβάσεως.”

<sup>29</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17, 9, PG 53.145-46. “. . . οἱ μὲν ἵνα μὴ ἀνέχωνται τῶν πονηρὰ συμβουλευουσῶν· αἱ δὲ ἵνα μὴ τοιοῦτα συμβουλεύωσιν.” He repeats this a few lines further: “Ἀλλ’ ὅμως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ πολλὴν τὴν φυλακὴν ἐπιδεικνύσθω, ὥστε τὰ ὀλέθρια συμβουλεύουσιν ἀποσιεῖσθαι, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἑναυλον ἔχουσα τὴν τιμωρίαν ἣν ἐδέξατο ἡ Εὐὰ τὴν ὀλέθριαν ἐκείνην συμβουλὴν εἰσαγαγούσα τῷ ἀνδρὶ, μὴ τολμάτω τοιαῦτα συμβουλεύειν, μηδὲ μμείσθω τὴν Εὐάν, ἀλλ’ τῷ ὑποδεγνῆται σωφρονιζέσθω, κάκεινα συμβουλεύετω, ἃ καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸν ἀνδρα πάσης ἀπαλλάξει κολάσεως καὶ τιμωρίας.”

<sup>30</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17, 8, PG 53.144: “Μονονουχὶ ἀπολογούμενος πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ὁ φιλόανθρωπος Θεὸς ταῦτά φησιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁμότιμόν σε ἐδημιούργησα, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀξίας ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτῷ κοινωνεῖν ἔβουλήθην, καὶ ὥσπερ τῷ ἀνδρὶ, οὕτω καὶ σοὶ τὴν κατὰ πάντων ἀρχὴν ἐνεχείρισα· ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐχρῆσω εἰς δέον τῇ ὁμοτιμίᾳ, διὰ τοῦτό σε ὑποτάττω τῷ ἀνδρὶ, . . .” And Chrysostom, *On Corinthians*, Hom. 26, 2(3), PG 61.215: “Ὅτε δὲ κακῶς ἐχρῆσατο τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ ἡ γενομένη βοήθης ἐπιβουλή εὐρέθη καὶ πάντα ἀπώλειο, τότε ἀκούει δικαίως λαοὶν· ‘Πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα σοὶ ἡ ἀποστρόφῃ σου.’” Procopius, *Commentarii in Genesim*, PG 87 (1): 209A, makes the same comment: “ἡ δὲ ἀπάτη τῆς Εὐᾶς παρέλυσε τὴν τιμὴν, καὶ δούλην ταύτην ἐργάσατο· ὁ γὰρ Ἀδάμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀπόστολον, ἀλλ’ ἡ γυνὴ κακῶς ἄρξασα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, αἰτία γέγονεν αὐτῷ τῆς παραβάσεως· ὥς οὖν οὐκ ἄρξασα καλῶς, εἰς τὸ δουλεῖν αὐτὴ περιτρέπεται.”

<sup>31</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17.8: “Ἐπειδὴ καταλιπούσα τὸν ὁμότιμον, καὶ τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς σοὶ φύσεως κοινωνοῦντα, καὶ δι’ ὃν ἐδημιουργήθης, τῷ πονηρῷ θηρίῳ τῷ ὄφει

Chrysostom adds that since Eve did not know how to rule, let her learn well how to be ruled. Part of the price of Eve's role in the Fall, then, is silence in church, i.e., exclusion from the ministries of teaching and preaching (1 Corinthians 14.34 and 1 Timothy 2.11-13). Yet women in the Pauline congregations prophesied (basically, preached) and prayed in communal worship (1 Corinthians 11.6; Acts 21.9). So Chrysostom too modifies the harshness of these verses, understanding them within the context of one's individual spiritual level. He points out that sometimes the man is deceived while the wife remains undeceived. Then, he claims, the order is turned around and Paul gives her the right to teach in 1 Corinthians 7.16: "Wife, how do you know whether you will save your husband?"<sup>32</sup> In fact, he says, "οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτω διδάσκαλος ἰσχύσαι δυνήσεται ὡς γυνή."<sup>33</sup>

This fits into his overall philosophy because, for Chrysostom, the purpose of all order (and disorder) is to lead everything back to God. Thus, there is a double purpose to the curse in Genesis 3.16. Eve's punishment "fits the crime." But it also is aimed at woman's ultimate salvation. As Chrysostom remarks to the woman, "it is better for you to be subordinate to him and under his rule, than to enjoy license and power and bring yourself to the brink."<sup>34</sup>

But even so, male domination has limits. As mentioned earlier, Chrysostom cautions against understanding man as woman's "head," for instance, in terms of rule and subjection. And in his work *On Virginity*, he notes that in marriage the partners oblige themselves to a reciprocal submission. He quotes Genesis 3.16, but wonders what the reward is, and states that the master becomes slave to the servant.<sup>35</sup>

In conclusion, it is clear that Adam and Eve's sin disrupted the natural order and the initial equality of the sexes. Woman as the "image" of man is a description of her ontological relationship to man in the created order, a reflection of the relationship between the Son and the Father. Chrysostom ascribes woman's secondary status

---

εις ὁμιλίαν ἔλθειν ἡβουλήθης, καὶ τὴν παρ' ἐκείνου δέξασθαι συμβουλὴν διὰ τοῦτό σε λοιπὸν τοῦτω ὑποτάττω, καὶ τοῦτόν σου κύριον ἀποφαίνω, ὥστε τὴν τοῦτου δεσποτείαν ἐπιγινώσκειν, καὶ ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔγνως ἄρχειν, μάθι καλῶς ἀρχεσθαι."

<sup>32</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17, 9, PG 53.145.

<sup>33</sup>Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, Hom. 19, 3 (4), PG 61.155.

<sup>34</sup>Chrysostom, *On Genesis*, Hom. 17, 8, PG 53.145.

<sup>35</sup>Chrysostom, *On Virginity*, 41, Sources Chrétiennes, no. 125, p. 236.

to the Fall and its consequences. Her subjection to man is presumed to have a salvific purpose achieved by man's proper guidance of woman toward God. But if the woman is the better spiritual guide, Chrysostom allows it, even though it subverts the "natural" order of fallen humanity. (This exercise of *οικονομία* can, I think, be seen in a political context several centuries later: namely, the reign of the empress Irene as *αὐτοκράτωρ* in her own right.)

Yes, Chrysostom counsels women to be obedient and submissive to their husbands. But, this is not because he believes woman to be by nature inferior to man or that her ontological relationship to him is one of subjection and domination. It must be seen within the context of his encouraging woman to use her subjection to her own spiritual benefit, just as he encourages the slave not to take advantage of his freedom even when it is offered to him.<sup>36</sup> Yet the husband is also cautioned against a domineering attitude toward his wife. And of course, as Chrysostom points out in his work *On Virginity*, celibacy frees woman from many of these effects of humanity's fallen state.

<sup>36</sup>See Chrysostom, *On 1 Corinthians*, Hom. 19, 4, PG 61.156, for his exegesis of 1 Cor. 7.21. He writes: "Ἄλλ' εἰ καὶ δύναιται ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον χρῆσαι· τουτίστι, μᾶλλον δοῦλε. Καὶ τί δήποτε τὸν δυνάμενον ἐλευθερωθῆναι, κελεύει μένειν δοῦλον; Θέλων δεῖξαι, ὅτι οὐδὲν βλάπτει ἡ δουλεία, ἀλλὰ ὠφελεῖ."

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Must God Remain Greek? Orthodox Reflections on Christian Faith and Culture

---

STANLEY S. HARAKAS

I AM GRATEFUL TO TOM BEST AND T. K. THOMAS FOR THE INVITATION to put down on paper some of my reflections on the Seventh Assembly for this issue of *The Ecumenical Review*, while I am still at the Assembly. Tomorrow we leave Canberra for our homes, and I reflect on the numerous wonderful experiences shared here during these two weeks.

The Canberra experience — to say the least — has been rich, varied, and complex. It would take many more pages than I have to merely list them, and much more space to interpret them. Nevertheless, for me as an Orthodox priest and theologian, the overarching concern has been the confrontation in this Assembly of a liberation theology approach to mission and church life with the traditional approach to theology and church life.

In one of the conference newspaper stories, Conrad Reiser bemoaned that these two perspectives did not have an opportunity to get beyond conflict and contrast. In this reflection (and it cannot be considered anything more than that), I want to address the issue of these two approaches to the Christian message while still immersed in the Assembly context.

What happened here was not a first encounter for me with persons or ideas inspired by the approach to theology, religion, ethics, and missions that begins from the ground up. For example, there was a conference I attended in Philadelphia a number of years ago whose theme was that Christian encounter with other religions should begin with a rejection by Christians of the uniqueness of Christ and his

saving work. Such views were promoted in the persons and writings of Paul Knitter, Raimundo Pannikar, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, and Leonard Swidler. I remember reacting quite negatively then, a response that appeared in the published proceedings, *Howard's Universal Theology of Religion*.

A similar negative reaction was provoked during the Assembly by Professor Chung's presentation in which the Holy Spirit was seen as the "spirit" of many different persons and things, including religious beings and ideas from her traditional Korean background. These lines are provoked by this reaction.

### *Must God Remain Greek?*

Robert Hood, a black theologian in the United States, raised this issue recently in a provocative way by asking at this year's American Academy of Religion meeting in the title of his presentation: "Must God Remain Greek? Can Euro-American Christian Doctrines Be Inclusive for Afro God-Talk?" It was his way of asking whether for Christianity, there was only one way of articulating the Christian faith. He asked the question "Must God Remain Greek?" to point to the historical and cultural setting of the apostolic community and the early Church, which formulated its method of conveying the "Good News" influenced by a Greek world, with its problems, language, metaphysics, and religious preconceptions.

In this context, to ask if God is Greek is to react sharply against an approach to Christianity that apparently sanctifies one culture and its thought forms at the expense of every other. In the specific contexts of Black, Feminist, and Third World theological approaches, the pain of this question becomes even sharper. For Blacks and others of color, the question also asks if God is white; for women, it asks if God is male; for Third World Christians, it asks if God is a colonialist. In missionary, indigeneous, local church terms it is a reaction against a missionary tactic that too readily discarded a suppressed local national and cultural values and experience, in order to impose the supposed superior European values on "less developed" peoples. To ask "Must God Remain Greek?" is a way of struggling to find and identify the validity of one's own existence and its legitimacy in the Kingdom of God.

It is not difficult to understand why a spirit of rebelliousness accompanies the question. As I reflect on the way some respond to the question, I try to do so in the comprehensive, inclusive, revelatory,



mystical, sacramental tradition of Eastern Orthodox Christianity. Must God Remain Greek? My answer is paradoxical: No! Yes! Somehow!

*God Is Not Greek — Nor Korean, Nor Australian, Nor White . . .*

The first lesson an Orthodox student of theology learns is the fundamental distinction between God and everything else. This “apophatic,” or negative, theological approach tells us that in a fundamental and essential way nothing in human experience can be identified with what God is. For this reason, the Orthodox begin their theologizing with an affirmation of unbridgeable ignorance of creatures regarding what God is in the very being of divine existence. It was Saint John of Damascus who in the eighth century summarized this view: “God is unknowable and incomprehensible. The only thing knowable and comprehensible about God is his unknowability and his incomprehensibility.”

Those who would theologize should tack that quote at eye-level above their writing desks (or computer monitors). No system of thought, no human categories, no cultural expressions, no human words, no art, no symbols, can fully capture the being of God for us. God is simply, fully, and totally transcendent to human experience in his being. God is not Greek. Nor is God Korean, nor European, nor Australian, nor white, black or yellow, nor male or female. Everyone who reflects on God must stand in awe before God’s total holy otherness. To call God “holy” precisely means that we acknowledge God’s transcendence.

*Yes, “God Is Greek” in Important Ways for Christians*

The second thing a student of Orthodox theology learns is that while God is wholly unknown and totally unapproachable in his being (the divine essence), God has made himself known to the created world and to humanity through his divine energies. For the Orthodox, God’s energies are nothing other than God reaching out to create, sustain, provide for, nurture, and save the cosmos that he has created. The divine energies are divine grace. Every creature and person and culture is sustained by the energies of God. In this sense all creation is imbued with the Spirit of God, even when it is distorted and corrupted by sin. Similarly, every human existence and every human culture is in some way or another sustained by divine grace, i.e., the divine energies.

The story of salvation, however, makes a clear distinction between

the sustaining energies of God and the redeeming, restoring, healing, saving energies of God. This story of salvation is based on the *use* for divine purpose of two cultures, the Hebrew and the Greek, to convey the saving message. The key to this statement, however, is not the cultures mentioned, but the "use" of them. Both were "used" to become vehicles of communication with and for redemption and salvation.

It is very important to see *how* they were used. A good example is the prologue to the Gospel of John. From the early Greek philosopher Herakleitos, the Greek word "logos" served the interests of philosophy. Every major Greek philosopher used it. It was a sign and mark of Greek culture, if anything could be. But the Fourth Gospel's use of it had to be unrecognizable to first century Greek philosophers. You could say that in Christian hands the Greek term "logos" was scooped out so that only the shell remained. That was all the Greek that was left. In the Gospel of John, the term "logos" was packed with a new meaning, a Christian meaning, an incarnational, trinitarian meaning.

Now this is my point. The Scriptures we have are the only ones we have. The Christian tradition preceded the Greek Scriptures, gave them this concrete form, and subsequently interpreted them. The Scriptures themselves *use* Hebrew and Greek. The vehicles we have to understand the revelation of God are formulated in this particular cultural form. We have no other. But the reality is that these sources of revelation are the products of an incarnational reality. In themselves the Hebrew culture and the Greek culture are not sources of revelation, not redemptive, not adequate for the renewal of the cosmos, including the life of fallen and sinful human beings.

Is God Greek? Well, in the sense that this particular culture provided the outward form for the expression of God's revelation in Jesus Christ, the answer is "yes." There is this Hebrew/Greek particularity which simply cannot be substituted by any other. But, if "God is Greek" in this sense, it is an external identification. After all, we are told that in Christ, "there is no Jew, nor Greek" (Gal 3.28). There is a tightrope here that requires us to walk it with care. There is a paradox here that should not be relaxed.

In ecumenical relations, the *WCC Basis* serves to keep this reality before us. The basis expresses this core reality: the Trinity and the Savior Jesus Christ and the Church. In the history of the Church it was expressed in its Creed: an affirmation of Father, Son, and Holy

Spirit, of the saving person and work of Jesus Christ, of the Church, the sacraments, and the eschatological expectation of the Kingdom. If this is Greek, so be it. Without it there is chaos. But if it is Greek, it is a Greek which has been scooped out and packed full of a new meaning, a Christian meaning.

*Somehow Acknowledging the Given, and Incarnating the Unknown*

But that is not the end of the story. The best missionary theory of both Eastern and Western Christianity — Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant — knew that just as “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us,” (Jn 1.14) the Christian message must be incarnated in the languages, cultures, and mindsets of all people, *using* every possible cultural expression to convey the saving message. The message and its “way” must be genuinely available to cultures, nations, races, genders, ages, intelligence, and way of life.

The struggle here is how to acknowledge the integrity of the given character of the revelation while being able to incarnate it in every human condition. The continuing dilemma of the Bible translator is one example of the difficulty of doing it. Concurrently, the urgency of the translator’s task also hammers home the necessity of incarnating the Gospel in every language, and the necessity of doing it well.

At the Assembly, Professor Chung Hyan-Kyung’s dramatic presentation of the theme was a powerful articulation of the striving of peoples to affirm the incarnational dynamic of the Christian message. But for many, it also showed how dangerous the effort can be. Seeking to incarnate the Gospel in culture can slip into the substitution of the Gospel by culture. When some participants in the Assembly saw much more in the presentation than a fitting and appropriate incarnation of the Christian message in other cultural forms, they became disturbed. Some (not all) aspects of the presentation conveyed the message that any aspect of culture, any religious affirmation, any ritual of a people could in itself be a source of Christian revelation. Some Orthodox quickly responded with charges of “paganism” and “syncretism.” Harsh criticism, indeed.

The *Assembly Line* issue of Monday, February 11, conveyed an invitation in response from Professor Chung to the Orthodox participants to debate what appeared to them as “syncretism and paganism” in her Plenary presentation. Unfortunately, this response indicated that she did not understand that the issue itself, in Orthodox perception, was beyond debate. The Orthodox felt that by shifting

from the incarnation of the Christian message in a particular culture, to the making of a particular culture a source of redemptive revelation, an important line had been crossed.

The issue was not "your traditions" and "our traditions." The Orthodox appreciation of the cultures of people and their incorporation into the fabric of Christian life is well known. The Orthodox have been doing this since Pentecost. While Western Christianity during the Middle Ages was imposing a dead liturgical language upon every nation and culture, Orthodoxy was translating Scripture and liturgy into the languages of different peoples and incarnating the Christian faith in indigenous cultures and national heritages from the earliest centuries. The first nation to become officially Christian was Armenia in the early fourth century, with its own language, its own liturgy, and its own native clergy. One look around a plenary meeting of the Assembly gives clear visual witness to that truth. The multiplicity of forms of clerical garb among the Orthodox, Eastern and Oriental, is a sign of the plurality of cultures within the Orthodox Church.

The fundamental missionary principles of Orthodox Christianity have been and are today incarnational in spirit and practice. Wherever possible, the language, culture, traditions, and customs of peoples are respected and incorporated into church life. The critical difference between this age-long practice and what the Orthodox saw and heard in Professor Chung's presentation and in other expressions of this theological approach is to be found in the word "possible" in the previous sentence.

For, in every tradition and nation and culture, there are elements which are contradictory to the Gospel. There are beliefs and practices that are not compatible with the fundamental affirmations of the Christian faith. In short, as the Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Australia, Stylianos Harkianakis, put it, "We are ready to accept everything as long as it is acceptable." What makes it acceptable is that it not contradict the essential core of the Christian faith as described above. The Orthodox themselves must struggle against nationalisms that become idolatries. We know of what we speak.

To equate the Christian message with every other religious affirmation and tradition is unacceptable. If this were the case there would be no "good news" in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This theology, in effect, negates the uniqueness and the necessity of the person of the divine/human Jesus Christ and his redemptive work for the world. It confuses all the "spirits" of this world with the "Holy Spirit."

This confusion is not new. The Scriptures describe similar confusions and reject them. Not all spirits are good. There are “demonic spirits” (Rev 16.14). The Lord Jesus cast them out (Mt 8.16), and he gave the disciples “authority over unclean spirits” (Mk 6.7). One of the gifts of the Holy Spirit is “the ability to distinguish between spirits” (1 Cor 12.10).

The early Church was instructed, precisely, not to “believe every spirit,” but “to test the spirits to see whether they are of God” (1 Jn 4.1). If the early Church were to have followed this syncretistic approach, then Apollo and Zeus and Minerva and Aphrodite would also have been accepted as Christian, and the blood of the martyrs would have been poured out for no purpose. The martyrs died precisely because they saw that offering just a little incense to the false gods of Rome was idolatry.

This was not debatable for the first Christians. It is not debatable for the Orthodox and many other Christians today. Our incarnational theology provokes us to “accept everything that is acceptable.” But those approaches that confuse the unconfusable and equate the Savior and the Holy Spirit with every and any other “spirit,” “god,” and religious conception are unacceptable. The Orthodox hold that we must spurn and reject that which contradicts the fundamental centrality of the Triune God.

As we “discerned the spirits” in Professor Chung’s presentation, we recognized with her many “good spirits” from the Korean culture. For these, we are grateful. We pray that every people and culture can find ways by which the Holy Spirit can be incarnated in everything good in their cultures. As the letter to the Philippians puts it in another context, “. . . whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is gracious, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things” (Phil 4.8). And we would add, incorporate them into your expression of the Christian faith. But, by way of method, the affirmation in the same epistle remains crucial.

Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death — even death on a cross.

Therefore God also highly exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father (Phil 2.5-11, NRSV).

### *Conclusion*

So, "Must God Remain Greek?" receives a paradoxical answer. No! Yes! Somehow! There is a core Christian truth that is to be found expressed in the shell of a culture. It is historically what it is. It is there, in the Greek Scriptures and the early Christian tradition that the tradition of revelation is to be found. There is no other. There is no substitute for it. But it is a message and "way" that must itself be incarnated in every culture and nation and people (including that of modern-day Greeks) and for all persons in the lived reality of their concrete experience.

The quarrel with the liberation theology approach is that it collapses an uncollapsible tension and makes the creature the criterion of the "Logos." Rather, for Christianity it must be the other way around: "In the beginning was the Word (the Logos)" (Jn 1.1).

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Origen and Mariology

---

IGOR GOLDEN

THE TWELFTH CENTURY IN NORTHERN EUROPE WITNESSED THE greatest flowering of the cultus devoted to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Mariological reflection during this period understood the prolific yet controversial Alexandrian theologian Origen (285-c.354) to be not only a precursor in this discipline but also considered him to be a veritable Marian doctor as well. This perception is delightfully exemplified in a little tale related by Henri Crouzel at the beginning of his exhaustive essay "La Théologie mariale d'Origène."<sup>1</sup> The tale focuses on the Rhenish nun-mystic, Saint Elizabeth of Schönaue<sup>2</sup> (d. 1168), whose ecstatic visions were edited in three volumes by her brother Egbert, the abbot of the double Benedictine Abbey near Bonn at which she was superioress. On Christmas night, upon seeing an apparition of the Virgin Mary, she posed a question which was long vexing her.

"My Lady, I ask you to reveal something to me concerning that great doctor of the Church, Origen, who in many places within his works, sang your praises in such magnificent fashion. Is he saved or is he not?"

After having replied that Origen's errors did not derive from any malice of intent but "from the excessive fervor in which he immersed himself in the depths of Holy Scripture which

<sup>1</sup> Henri Crouzel, "La Théologie mariale d'Origène," *Origène: Homélies sur S. Luc*, Sources Chrétiennes 87 (Paris, 1962), pp. 11-63. Henceforth, all references to this article in these footnotes will read: Crouzel, SC 87, page reference.

<sup>2</sup> Crouzel, SC 87, p. 11.



he loved and in the divine mysteries which he scrutinized with excess," the Mother of God added, "and because of the glory he bestowed upon me in his writing, he shines with a special light on every feastday in which my memory is celebrated."

The answer was more than an implied affirmative.

The adulation of the medieval church notwithstanding, to speak of Origen as a Mariologist is premature at best; it is to remove him from his context in the history of the development of doctrine. Christian theology in the third century was still very much in a pristine phase of development. Origen's prolific activity during this period is crucial to future theological development. Origen is the cornerstone on which theology in both East and West is built. Origen's interest in Mary in and for herself is marginal. As Hans von Campenhausen makes clear, "Origen was not, as he is sometimes supposed to have been, an enthusiastic champion of Marian devotion . . . In the whole of his theological reflections and the immense quantity of his writings, the occasional remarks about Mary are not central to his argument, and have no special importance."<sup>3</sup> Origen exhibits no special cultus to Mary nor does he regard her as an intercessor or mediatrix. The controversies concerning Mary's immaculate conception and assumption will not reach center stage for at least a millenium.

Von Campenhausen continues:

In exegetical contexts Origen sometimes, of course, has occasion to speak about Mary. Although his exposition is sometimes very wide, it does not for the most part go more deeply into the biographical relationships, but in general passes quickly over into the symbolic and allegorical. In this connection Mary is scarcely preferred to other biblical figures.<sup>4</sup>

Although Origen was long credited with being the originator of the term *Theotokos* in reference to Mary and later canonized by the Ecumenical Council of Ephesos in 431, the two Greek fragments on Luke where this term occurs, numbers 41 and 80 in the Berlin Edition,<sup>5</sup> the attribution to Origen is vigorously controverted. Jaroslav

<sup>3</sup> Hans von Campenhausen, *The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church. Studies in Historical Theology 2*. Trans. Frank Clarke (Naperville, IL, 1964), pp. 57-58.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 60.

<sup>5</sup> Hilda Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion 1* (New York, 1963), p. 46.

Pelikan accepts the tradition that the title *Theotokos* for Mary emerged from Alexandria, but instead of seeing this as an invention of Origen, maintains that the "earliest incontestable instance of the term *Theotokos* was in the encyclical of Alexander of Alexandria directed against Arianism in 324."<sup>6</sup> Henri Crouzel, however, is convinced that Origen would have had no difficulty in calling Mary the Mother of God in the same sense as the Council of Ephesos. He cites a passage from *The Ecclesiastical History* of Sokrates which reads: "The ancients did not hesitate, they dared to call Mary Mother of God . . . Origen, himself, in the first volume of his commentaries on the letter of the Apostle to the Romans, explains how she is called Mother of God and examines this expansively." Also, Crouzel admits that Rufinus' translation did not preserve this development, but he does not regard this omission as an objection to Sokrates' information.<sup>7</sup>

This paper will focus on those parts of Origen's massive works where reference is made to Mary. It will focus on his perception of her within the framework of the history of Christian redemption. As shall be demonstrated, Mary is, for Origen, only worthy of discussion in context with her Son Jesus. Mary disembodied from her Son is impossible for him. The central focus of his theological inquiry is the eternal Logos and the actualization of human salvation. Speculation on Mary outside her role as human vessel for the Logos is practically non-existent.

If Origen contributed anything to the development of Mariology, most of the documentation stems from the thirty-nine homilies on Luke.<sup>8</sup> It is hardly surprising that the indefatigable Jesuit Origen scholar, Henri Crouzel, should choose as a preface to the *Sources Chrétiennes* edition of Origen's Lucan homilies, an essay on the Alexandrian's Mariology.<sup>9</sup> Crouzel, at the outset of his essay, admits that

<sup>6</sup> Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine, Vol. 1 (Chicago, 1971), p. 241.

<sup>7</sup> Sokrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 7, 32, quoted in Crouzel, SC 87, p. 21.

<sup>8</sup> Ambrose Agius, "Origen and Our Lady: A Balanced Sheet." *Clergy Review*, 43 (1958) 672.

<sup>9</sup> The only major attempt to analyze Origen's Mariology in this century comes from the effort of Dom Cipriano Vagaggini, *Maria nelle opere di Origene* OCA 131 (Rome, 1942). This volume is valuable not only because it is the only book extant on the topic (pace von Campenhausen's complaint that it has a "somewhat one-sided preference for the Latin tradition"), but it also contains a *Corpus Mariologicum* which contains all the relevant Mariological texts in both Greek and Latin from Origen's writings.

extracting Marian dogma from the Origen corpus yields a meagre harvest, but perhaps what it does generate is much more valuable than previously assumed. Crouzel asserts:

In the numerous lists of the faith propositions that we encounter in (Origen's) work, only one point of marian dogma is mentioned; Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary. This assertion has two parts: 1) Jesus was born of a woman, therefore he is truly man and not just an appearance of humanity; 2) this woman was a virgin; the miracle of the virginal conception proves the divinity of the child. Thus the double nature of the God-Man is implied.<sup>10</sup>

For Origen, it is not just a random decision to accept that Jesus was born of a virgin. Origen insists that Jesus' flesh was truly taken from Mary's flesh; this is expressed repeatedly throughout the homilies and other works.

Crouzel is convinced that Origen was the first theologian to espouse the perpetual virginity of Mary. Justin and Irenaios, writing during the second century, only taught Mary's virginity implicitly by referring to her as Mary the Virgin.

For Origen this is by no means, as has been suggested, an open question, with no obligation on the Christian to believe it: it is the only 'healthy' view of the matter and that word is used to express a close connection with the faith; those who uphold the contrary are treated as heretics; Mary among women is the first fruits of virginity as Jesus is among men.<sup>11</sup>

Origen's not-so-secret agenda is to refute those heretics, Docetists, Marcionites, and Ebionites, et al., who would deny this assertion. When

---

Since its appearance in 1962, Crouzel's essay seems to have commanded the attention of the majority of scholars treating the subject. It is obvious that they sequentially adhere to the contours of Crouzel's presentation. Not to be out of step with such distinguished company, this writer will follow the order of Père Crouzel's essay including other scholars as needed.

<sup>10</sup>Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 12.

<sup>11</sup>Henri Crouzel, *Origen, The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*. Trans. A. S. Worrall (San Francisco, 1989), p. 141.

Jesus assumed flesh, he was like us in all things except that he was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. For Origen, Docetists, those people who believed that Jesus only gave the appearance of humanity, have stripped the mystery of Christian redemption of its reality. For Christ to have saved man in his entirety, and for Origen this means the three constituent elements which comprise man, body, soul, and spirit, he would have had to take on all three of these. The Docetists claimed that the Lord's body was taken not from flesh but from heavenly matter. According to Origen, they have dissolved the nativity of Jesus into a phantasmal stage production.<sup>12</sup>

When Marcion produced his own scriptural canon, he stripped the gospel accounts of any passages which emphasized Jesus' humanity. Those which supported his position, suppressing Jesus' humanity in favor of his divinity were retained. Mary is not the origin of Jesus, who is human only in appearance. Mary played a role; she served only as an instrument of an illusory birth. Other heretics believed that Jesus appeared in Judea at age thirty or that the Virgin believed that she had given birth to Jesus, but had not actually given birth.

On the other hand, those Christians who only stressed Jesus' humanity also earned Origen's ire. Concerning the Ebionites he writes: "Let us admit that some also accept Jesus and on that account boast that they were Christians although they still want to live according to the law of the Jews like the multitude of the Jews. These are the two sects of Ebionites, the one confessing as we do that Jesus was born of a virgin, the other holding that he was not born in this way but like other men."<sup>13</sup>

Origen is convinced that the prophecy proclaimed in the Septuagint rendering of Isaiah 7.14 (Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son. And she shall call his name Emmanuel, God with us) is fulfilled in the person of Jesus. He dismisses any attempt to claim that the Hebrew word *ahlma* (young woman) was mistranslated into the Greek with *parthenos* (virgin) as opposed to *neavis* (young woman).

What sort of sign would it be if a young woman not a virgin bore a son? And which would be more appropriate as the

<sup>12</sup>Origen, *In Ezechielem Homiliae*, I, 4, quoted in Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup>Origen, *Contra Celsum*, V, 61, quoted in *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Henry Chadwick. (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 311-12.

mother of Emmanuel, that is 'God with us,' a woman who has had intercourse with a man and conceived by female passion, or a woman who was still chaste and pure and a virgin? It is surely fitting that the later should give birth to a child at whose birth it is said 'God is with us.'<sup>14</sup>

The birth of Jesus must be extraordinary in order to manifest his divinity. Jesus' body is in effect " 'not a temple made with human hands, it is not through human action that the temple of flesh was built within the Virgin.' The direct action of God built within Mary this temple which is the body of the Savior."<sup>15</sup>

The virginity of Mary is intimately linked by Origen to the divinity of Christ. God could only allow himself to be born of a virgin; inversely, only a virgin could be chosen in order to bring forth God into the world.<sup>16</sup>

It is because of the above reasons that Origen is particularly sensitive to the charge that Jesus was the product of an adulterous union between Mary and a Roman soldier named Panthera. The accusation published by Celsus is repeated verbatim by Origen in *Contra Celsum* for the purpose of refuting it. The libel reads.

'He (Jesus) fabricated the story of his birth from a virgin. He came from a Jewish village and from a poor country woman who earned her living by spinning. She was driven out by her husband, who was a carpenter by trade, as she was convicted of adultery. After she had been driven out by her husband and while she was wandering about in a disgraceful way she secretly gave birth to Jesus. Because he was poor he hired himself out as a workman in Egypt, and there tried his hand at certain magical powers on which the Egyptians pride themselves; he returned full of conceit because of these powers, and on account of them gave himself the title of God.'<sup>17</sup>

The name Panthera has, according to Crouzel, its own agenda.

---

<sup>14</sup>Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 1, 35, in Chadwick Translation, p. 34.

<sup>15</sup>Origen, *In Exodum homiliae*, 12, quoted in Crouzel, SC 87, p. 22.

<sup>16</sup>Crouzel, SC 87, p. 28.

<sup>17</sup>Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 1, 28, in Chadwick translation, p. 28.

It is an artificially created name, a real man could not have carried it. It translates from Greek to signify one who is completely given over to perversion. Chadwick, however, citing H. L. Strack, rejects the view that it is a corruption of  *pornos*.<sup>18</sup> Within the same footnote, Gustav Adolph Deissman demonstrates that the name was common for this period, especially as the family name for Roman soldiers.<sup>19</sup> The conclusion that the name is derived from the Latin *pandarus* signifying pimp or panderer, Marina Warner shows to be a medieval development in the etymology of the word.<sup>20</sup>

Origen argues that God would not choose that his son be born of a shameful, adulterous union; it could only be a miraculous occurrence.

It is declared positively that for the fulfillment of his calling Jesus had on one hand to be united to human beings and possess something in common with them, and therefore come in the body of Mary's flesh; and that on the other hand he ought also to show some quality beyond the ordinary, so that his soul could remain untouched by evil.<sup>21</sup>

Von Campenhausen, commenting on Origen's reaction to the charge of Jesus' illegitimate birth, remarks: "... that is an impossibility, if only because 'according to experience' none but inferior people are produced by illicit unions, whereas Jesus' personality was of unique moral elevation and purity."<sup>22</sup>

Origen seems to be somewhat ambivalent about *virginitas in partu*. In his homilies on Luke he seems to deny it. On the other hand, his homilies on Leviticus, delivered later in his career, affirm it. Origen is the only one of the early Christian writers to tell the following tale implying Mary's *virginitas in partu*. It occurs in his commentary on Matthew which is preserved in the Greek original. It deals with a peculiar reference to the priest Zachariah found in Matthew 23.35. Origen is convinced that this same Zachariah was murdered between

---

<sup>18</sup>Chadwick, p. 31, nt 3.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Marina Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex* (New York, 1976), p. 367, nt 4.

<sup>21</sup>von Campenhausen, p. 59.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

the temple and the altar.

Now Mary, after giving birth to the Savior, went to worship and stood in the place of the virgins. And when those who knew she had given birth were preventing her, Zachariah said to them that she was worthy of the place of the virgins, because she was a virgin. Therefore, as he was evidently transgressing the Law and allowed a woman to take her place among the virgins, they killed him between the temple and the altar.<sup>23</sup>

According to Raymond Brown in his celebrated work on the infancy narratives, *The Birth of the Messiah*, Origen is apparently weaving another strand of the Zachariah myth found in the Protevangelium of James. In that work Herod kills the priest Zachariah ("between the temple and the altar") for refusing to divulge the whereabouts of John the Baptist. "Origen compounds the confusion," Brown writes, "with his report of Mary standing with the virgins . . . as a result of which defense he was killed between the Temple and the altar. This story played an important part in patristic tradition about the continued status of Mary as a Virgin."<sup>24</sup>

Only Jesus, for Origen, entered purely into generation, without being stained by father or mother. Joseph had no part in the conception of Jesus. He was available only for faithful service and for love. It is because of this that scripture bestows upon Joseph the title of father. Jesus, therefore, was penetrated into an uncontaminated body.

Origen's adamance that Joseph was not the father of Jesus leads one to wonder why Mary took a husband in the first place. Origen responds that the *mariage blanc* was necessary to hide the virginal conception from Satan, and by extension the divinity of the child. The Lord remained faithful to this domestic *status quo*, for if the fallen angels had known Jesus' true identity, they never would have crucified him. His death on the cross consummated their defeat and the victory of salvation.<sup>25</sup>

If Mary remained a virgin until her death, who are the brothers

---

<sup>23</sup>Origen, *Commentariorum Series*, 25 (GCS, vol. 9, p. 43, 5ff) quoted in Graef, p. 44.

<sup>24</sup>Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City, NY, 1977), p. 172.

<sup>25</sup>Crouzel, SC 87, p. 34.

and sisters of Jesus mentioned in the gospels? For Origen, these were not Jesus' natural brothers and sisters because Mary maintained her virginity and Jesus was not Joseph's son. They were Jesus' brothers only according to the Law, for publicly Joseph assumed paternity. Origen interprets the brothers of the Lord to refer to children born to Joseph and a deceased first wife — not mentioned in the gospel narrative.<sup>26</sup>

The coming of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High, that is the Word, thus brought to Mary such an extraordinary grace that it is inconceivable that she knew human child birth. The reason of her perpetual virginity is supereminent holiness caused by the descent of the two divine persons. Thus, Mary remained a virgin. Likewise, her son also remained a virgin. Both are elevated as models of purity and chastity for their respective genders. Jesus for men; Mary for women. The mother in this virtue is closely united with her son.<sup>27</sup> Origen writes in his *Commentary on Matthew*: "I think, therefore, that Jesus was the first fruits of holy purity for men, but Mary for women; for it would not sound fitting if one would single out anyone instead of her as the first fruits of virginity."<sup>28</sup> This glorification of Mary as a model of virginity did not take off immediately within the Christian community; virginity, on the other hand did. Von Campenhausen cynically calls to our attention that Origen's remarks "had no perceptible results; on the contrary, even after Origen, Mary plays a noticeably small part in the ascetic literature of the third and even the fourth century."<sup>29</sup> Subsequent patristic authors may be extravagant in adulation of virginity, but Mary as pen-ultimate symbol of virginity was not yet embedded in the theological consciousness of the third century.

If Crouzel is right, and Origen was the earliest Christian thinker to speak of the perpetual virginity of Mary, he does not exclude her, however, from human imperfection. Mary is not, according to Origen, the sinless virgin. His exegesis on the prophecy which Simeon made to Mary (Lk 2.35), "and a sword will pierce through your own soul also," interprets this verse as an indication of Mary's future doubt,

---

<sup>26</sup>Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 34.

<sup>27</sup>Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 39.

<sup>28</sup>Origen, *Commentarii in Matthaeum*, 10, 17, quoted in von Campenhausen, p. 63.

<sup>29</sup>von Campenhausen, p. 63.



albeit momentarily, of her own son. The sword is transformed into a metaphor for doubt.

In the seventeenth homily of Luke, Origen "recalls the word the Lord had spoken before his passion: 'you will be scandalized this night on my account' " (Mk 14.27).<sup>30</sup>

Why should we believe that, when the Apostles were scandalized, the Mother of the Lord remained immune from scandal? If she had not suffered scandal in the passion of the Lord, Jesus would not have died for her sins. But if all have sinned and need the glory of God, justified by his grace and redeemed' (Rom 3.23), then Mary, too, was scandalized at that time. Therefore Simeon prophesied also about the holy virgin Mary herself; for standing beside the Cross and seeing what is happening and hearing the voices of the killers—even after Gabriel's witness, after the ineffable knowledge of the divine conception, after the great showing forth of miracles, even you, who were taught from above the things of the Lord, will be perplexed and touched by dissension—that is the sword.<sup>31</sup>

In the final analysis, Mary's faith faltered, the same as the apostles. Crouzel explains Origen's position:

His first line of reasoning . . . assumes that the Mother of the Lord is not more perfect than the Apostles: if they who followed the preaching of Jesus were scandalized, to the point that Peter denied him three times, how would she not have been scandalized too? . . . According to Paul, all have sinned and need redemption: if she did not suffer scandal, then Jesus did not die for her. The origin of this doubt is easily understood: it is the contrast between the wonderful revelations she had concerning her son and the state (the Passion) in which she saw him. this moment of weakness will be short. According to a fragment on Luke the prophecy of Simeon gives a hint 'that after the scandal that the disciples and Mary will suffer

<sup>30</sup>Lucien Deiss, *Mary, Daughter of Sion*, Trans. Barbara T. Blair (Collegeville, 1972), p. 210.

<sup>31</sup>Origen, *In Lucam homiliae*, 17, 7, quoted in Graef, pp. 45-46.

before the Cross, a rapid cure will intervene: she will strengthen in their hearts the faith which they had in him.'<sup>32</sup>

Origen's exegesis has no foundation in scripture and did not find a place in later exegetical tradition. Mary was not present at the crucifixion in the synoptic passion narratives, and the Mary who appears at the foot of the cross during the Johannine passion can hardly qualify as a *mater dolorosa*. Origen's exegesis is ironic since the Simeon prophecy is found in Luke. Luke according to Raymond Brown, never attributes doubt to Mary but has a positive assessment of her as a disciple (8.31) and places her among the first community of believers following the ascension (Acts 1.14)<sup>33</sup>

The first two centuries of Christianity witnessed theology reacting against the various schools of Gnosticism. The role of Mary was accentuated only as far as she was living proof of Jesus' humanity and that he was born of a human mother. Jesus, therefore, was truly man and not the spectre of man. Pelikan writes:

But as Christian piety and reflection sought to probe the deeper meaning of salvation, the parallel between Christ and Adam found its counterpoint in the picture of Mary as the Second Eve, who by her obedience had undone the damage wrought by the disobedience of the mother of mankind. She was the mother of the man Christ Jesus, the mother of the Savior, but to be the Savior, he had to be god as well, and as his mother she had to be 'Mother of God.'<sup>34</sup>

Irenaios of Lyon, along with other second century writers, had eloquently and comprehensively written about Mary in terms of being Nea Eva/Nova Eva/New Eve. Origen does not concern himself extensively with this motif, but does not evade its expression either. Two allusions utilizing the Mary-as-New-Eve theme appear in his writings. In opening line of Homily 8 on Luke Origen writes:

Just as sin began through the fault of a woman thereby affect-

---

<sup>32</sup>Crouzel, *SC* 87, pp. 56-57.

<sup>33</sup>Brown, p. 462.

<sup>34</sup>Pelikan, p. 241.

ing all of mankind; thus did salvation come into the world through the agency of women so that all women, overcoming the weakness of their gender, imitate the life and the conduct of the holy women, in particular of those that the Gospel now depicts for us.<sup>35</sup>

Crouzel comments on this motif:

Sin began through woman, but the 'beginning of good things' also came through the women, Mary and Elizabeth, who inaugurated the history of salvation. Following a fragment on Luke, Eve brought sorrow and the curse to the entire female gender, Mary, on the other hand, gave to her gender blessing and joy.<sup>36</sup>

In this examination of the references to the mother of Jesus culled from the works of Origen, it is evident that the assessment of Elizabeth of Schönau esteeming the Alexandrian as a Marian doctor was generous, but unfortunately, not accurate. Origen's occasional utterances concerning Mary are hardly on a par with Elizabeth's contemporary, Bernard of Clairvaux. It is true that later writers drew upon Origen's marian utterances and expanded them into a full scaled mariology, but does this make Origen a pioneer in Mariology? This writer thinks not. Origen's consideration of Mary was only in her role as the one who would give birth to the savior of the world. He did, however, view her as a model of virginity, but as stated by von Campenhausen, that designation took almost another two hundred years to gain popularity. Origen, outside of lip service paid to the widespread second century conception of Mary as the New Eve, does not give Mary any titles which will play a significant role in the development of Mariology, i. e., Theotokos, Queen of Heaven, Mediatrix, etc. He does not concern himself, with the notable exception of the Zachariah vignette, with the details of Mary's biography. There is not speculation regarding her death. Origen did not advocate prayers directed for Mary's intercession nor did he compose tracts, hymns, or orations in her honor. The principal focus of Origen's literary activity is Christ the eternal Logos. Origen can not be faulted

<sup>35</sup>Origen, *In Lucam homiliae*, 8, 1, in Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 165.

<sup>36</sup>Crouzel, *SC* 87, p. 58.

for lacking an expansive mariology; marian questions were not on the syllabi of second and third century theologians. In response to Saint Elizabeth's inquiry into Origen's personal salvation, one would hope that after Origen's Mariological lacuna is uncovered that his moral uprightness, zeal for the scriptures, and all consuming love for the Logos delivered him beyond the front gates of Paradise into the eschatological banquet being celebrated within.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Paradigm Change in Sixth-Century Christology: The Contribution of Gregory the Theologian to the Christology of Severos of Antioch<sup>1</sup>

---

IAIN TORRANCE

I DO NOT INTEND TO GIVE A LISTING OF ALL OF SEVEROS' QUOTATIONS from Gregory the Theologian, though that would be valuable and interesting. Instead, I want to ask "Why was he valuable?" and "How was he used?" by Severos of Antioch.

We are living at a time when it is fashionable to speak of paradigm change. Theology must shift from thinking in Newton's world and move into Einstein's. This involves changes in how we understand time, space and the reference of symbol to reality. Severos also lived in a time of paradigm change, and the great councils, like Chalcedon, were attempts to channel the direction of change by fixing the parameters within which a paradigm operated. So my real question is: "How and why is Gregory valuable to a person between paradigms?"

Clearly, Chalcedon was an attempt to protect a paradigm from the extremes of either Alexandrian or Antiochene thinking, and so to restrict how an understanding of Christ was expressed. It does this most successfully by means of the four Chalcedonian adverbs, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation, with

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read to a small conference in Durham organized by Dr. George Dragas to commemorate the 1600 anniversary of the dormition of St. Gregory the Theologian. I am most grateful to Fr. George for his invitation, and to Bishop Kallistos and Dr. Andrew Louth for their comments.

which Severos could have had no disagreement. But it is evident that he had sharp disagreement with the Tome of Leo. Severos' complaint is that the parameters have been set in the wrong place. A paradigm is being proposed which is too close, in his view, to a forbidden area. Severos is then in the notoriously difficult position of trying to show how he distances himself from a paradigm, when that existing paradigm is the source of the only vocabulary he has. It is here, I suggest, that he draws upon Gregory.

I shall give a very brief outline of Severos' life. He did not inhabit an ivory tower. His theology is made up of his controversies. I shall then explore how he distanced himself from Sergius, an extreme monophysite who invoked the support of Gregory for his views, and how, in turn, Severos counter-invoked Gregory both to subvert Sergius, and, I suggest, to lay the foundation for a different way of thinking, a new paradigm.

Severos was born at Sozopolis in Pisidia round about 465. His family was wealthy and as a young man, not yet baptized, he was sent to Alexandria to study *grammatike* and *rhethorike*. From Alexandria he went to Beirut to study Roman law. At Beirut he came under the influence of a group of Christian students. He began to read Basil and Gregory the Theologian, and was baptized at the shrine of Leontios at Tripoli. There is some suggestion that his family was pagan, and what had taken place was his conversion to Christianity.

After baptism, Severos became increasingly ascetic. He qualified as an advocate, and visited Jerusalem, there deciding to become a monk. He withdrew into the desert of Eleutheropolis, where his prolonged asceticism made him ill, and he entered the convent of Romanos. At this stage his parents died, and from his inheritance Severos bought a convent near Maiuma. Maiuma had been the episcopal seat of Peter the Iberian, one of the bishops who had consecrated Timothy Aelurus, and we see Severos entering the monophysite tradition. He already rejected the Henotikon of Zeno.<sup>2</sup> A Chalcedonian monk, Nephalius, stirred up the Palestinian bishops against the anti-Chalcedonian monks, who began to be harassed. Nephalius wrote an *Apologia* for Chalcedon, and Severos replied with

---

<sup>2</sup>"*dum sederet prius in monasterio Iberi, non suscipiebat Zenonis edictum, nec Petrum Mongon . . .*" *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, 19, ACO 2.5, p. 133.13-16.

his two *Orationes*. This was his first important anti-Chalcedonian work, round about 508. Severos was expelled from his monastery by Nephalius and his party, and was sent to Constantinople to plead the anti-Chalcedonian case.

He spent the years 508-511 in Constantinople, where he rapidly gained the sympathy of Anastasios. The Chalcedonians in the capital made a collection of edited excerpts from Cyril, to show that he supported the Chalcedonian account of the two natures. This was given to Makedonios, who gave it to Anastasios. Severos in reply composed his *Philalethes*, which gave the true context of the quotations from Cyril. Not suprisingly, relations between Severos and Makedonios worsened, and in 511, after major disagreements with Anastasios over the Trisagion, Makedonios was expelled and replaced by Timothy.

In the meantime, Philoxenos was busy undermining the position of Flavian of Antioch. By instruction of Anastasios, in 512 a synod was assembled at Sidon. Flavian was presented with a list of 77 anathemas, and requested openly to anathematize Chalcedon. This he refused, being unwilling to "arouse the sleeping dragon, and corrupt many with his poison."<sup>3</sup> Philoxenos and his monks impeached him as a heretic, and he was ejected on the order of Anastasios.

Consequently, in November 512 Severos was consecrated Patriarch of Antioch. In his enthronement address, Severos affirmed Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesos. He allowed that the Henotikon gave an "orthodox confession of the faith," but *explicitly* anathematized Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, as well as Nestorios, Eutyches, Diodore and Theodore. At the Synod of Tyre in 514 the assembled bishops *openly* anathematized Chalcedon and the Tome. What we are seeing is an attempt to change the parameters, to subvert the existing orthodoxy. This did indeed arouse the sleeping dragon.

Anastasios died in July 518. Justin, soon after taking office ordered Severos to be arrested and punished for the dissension he had caused. Under threat of having his tongue cut out, Severos escaped to Egypt. There he lived a harried existence. He completed his correspondence with Sergios, and wrote his great anti-Chalcedonian work, the *Liber contra impium Grammaticum* (around 519).

Around 530 Justinian relaxed the persecution of the monophysites and summoned their leaders to a *collatio* with the Chalcedonians in

---

<sup>3</sup>*The Syriac Chronicle*, Bk. 7, ch. 10, p. 179 (Hamilton and Brooks' translation).



Constantinople. Severos came in the winter of 534/5. At the same time, Anthimos of Trebizond, an anti-Chalcedonian, succeeded Epiphaneios as Patriarch of Constantinople, and Theodosios, a friend of Severos, became bishop of Alexandria. This so alarmed the Chalcedonian Ephraim of Antioch that he sent an envoy to Agapetos in Rome. Agapetos arrived in Constantinople in 536 as the ambassador of the Goths to Justinian. Politics won, as Justinian's interests lay in the West. Anthimos was replaced by the Chalcedonian Menas, and Severos was condemned and banished in 536. He returned to Egypt, seemingly with the help of the Empress Theodore, and died around 538. He would have been about 73.

The correspondence between Severos and Sergios begins from a pastoral situation. Sergios wrote to Antonios of Aleppo asking what statement of belief he should impose on converted Dyophysites. He offered a formula of his own, which was of an extreme monophysite sort. Effectively, it was an affirmation which so emphasized the unity of the natures that their integrity was lost, and Christ, effectively, became a new third entity, neither quite like God, nor quite like human persons. This formula was corrected by the assembly to which it had been submitted. Sergios was genuinely puzzled, and questioned the assembly. The truth was that there was a clash of different paradigms. Sergios quite literally was unable to hear what was being said to him. And so the matter was referred to Severos.

Severos, as always, drew upon the language and concepts of Cyril of Alexandria. If Christ is said to be of one nature, it does not follow that he is the product of a confusion of the natures. Sergios need not be afraid of preserving the particularities of the two natures (ἰδιότης ὡς ἐν ποιότητι φυσικῇ). Essentially, Severos tells him that confession of one nature need not lead to an extreme monophysite position,<sup>4</sup> nor does recognition of the particularities of the two natures lead to Nestorianism. He quotes Cyril against Nestorius: when we come to look at the mystery of the union in Christ, "the principle of union does not ignore the difference, but it removes the division;

---

<sup>4</sup>*Severi Antiocheni ac Sergii Grammatici Epistulae mutuae*, in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 119 (Syr. 64), Louvain, 1949, p. 76.1-2: "Therefore, do not ascribe the folly of the Synousiasts to this exact profession of the faith . . ." References are to page and line of the Syriac text. There is a Latin translation by J. Lebon in CSCO 120, and an English translation and introduction in my *Christology after Chalcedon* (Canterbury Press, 1988).

not because it confuses with each other or mixes the natures, but because the Word of God has shared in flesh and blood . . .'<sup>5</sup> And Severos illustrates this understanding of the union by pointing to the constitution of a human person. The fact that we can distinguish between body and spirit does not mean that we divide the one living being into two.

Now, in all this, Severos follows a classic Cyrillian line. But I want to suggest that it misses the point. It is merely argument by statement. Severos is still unaware that he and Sergios are operating with different paradigms. The illustration of the constitution of a human person is in fact very misleading. Its use implies that the union of the incarnation is some kind of static or event union, which will be adequately expressed as soon as there can be found a category which can cope with the combination of two natures of different type. And I shall try to show that Severos' understanding of the Incarnation is very different from this.

Sergios is, in fact, very confused by Severos' reply, and gives every indication that christologically, he and Severos are talking different languages. Severos had quoted Cyril: ". . . the principle of union does not ignore the difference, but it removes the division; not because it confuses with each other or mixes the natures, but because the Word of God has shared in flesh and blood. . . ."<sup>6</sup> In response to this, Sergios allows that when one speaks of the incarnation, one sets aside the category of confusion as a means of understanding the union of the natures. But here, much to his surprise, as this is a quotation from Cyril of all people, it seems to be stated that the union is not thought of wrongly when the natures are not mixed.

Sergios is devastated by this. He cannot understand it. There is a clash of paradigms, and what is interesting is to see how it is resolved.

If you deny me mixture, he complains, what category of union am I left with? Without mixture, how can I avoid Nestorianism, and affirm one nature of God the Word incarnate? The issue, ultimately, is that he had a false understanding of unity, but at this stage, to back up his paradigm that the union was internal and could be stated in event language, he cited Gregory the Theologian as a supporter,

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. p. 77.24-7; Cyril, *Volume Two against Nestorios*, PG 76.85A-B (= Pusey edition, Vol 6, p. 113.12-16).

<sup>6</sup>See note 4.

and pointed to his use of mixture language.<sup>7</sup> He argues that we are confronted with a bleak choice: either mixture, no matter what Severos may say, or Nestorian juxtaposition: thus, "unless the natures, from which Christ is, were mixed inconfusedly, how shall I say that those things which thus remained unmixed were united hypostatically?"<sup>8</sup>

Severos was not slow to respond. Extremely unhappy about Sergios' category of "mixture without confusion," he now recognizes that they are talking different Christological languages, and tries seriously to explain Cyril's understanding of the incarnation. What conceptual apparatus can he bring to bridge the gap between them?

The incarnation, he says, is not a confusion, not a mixture, but a "partaking" or "participating" in flesh and blood.<sup>9</sup> So is "participation" a metaphor which is sufficiently fertile to enable Sergios to make the imaginative leap into another paradigm? Severos initially tries to illustrate the idea by yet again pointing to the union of the rational soul to its body.<sup>10</sup> This is neither a conversion of the one to the other, nor is it like things which are stuck together. But we have already suggested that ultimately, the model of the union of body and mind is unhelpful. It comes too close to being just a wonderful and unspecified kind of mixture. It is a union which is self-enclosed, and can be stated in event language. Severos then tries to say that the union is "a natural coming together," a phrase which has little power to kindle the imagination, and that it "is beyond our comprehension." So far Severos has failed. Though he has an understanding of the incarnation which is quite different from Sergios', he is unable to find the right concepts to express this change of paradigm.

So Severos tries another track. The trouble with "assumption" as a model is that it can look very Nestorian: that which is assumed can seem to be merely something which is added on. Severos tries to dispel that idea, by quoting Cyril: "... the holy body was from Mary, but, then, in the first beginnings of the becoming firm or constitution in the womb, it was holy as the body of Christ, and one sees

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid. p. 99.19-22 (cf. Gregory the Theologian, *Letter 101 (Letter 1 to Cledonius)*, PG 37.181C).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. p. 100.16-19.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid. p. 105.4-11.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid. p. 105.12-20.

no time in which it did not belong to him . . .”<sup>11</sup> And, as often, having introduced a quotation, Severos comments on it constructively: “because the flesh . . . had existence in very union with the Word, . . . and did not exist independently before the union, . . . (therefore) the Word himself is believed immutably and without change to have become a child, while he remained that which he was and did not change or convert that which he took up. . . .”<sup>12</sup>

As an argument this is clever. It provides a way of saying that the union cannot be seen as a juxtaposition, because there were never two things to juxtapose. But what it does not do is explain how the union came about, or what was the relationship between God the Word and the assumed humanity once the union had been achieved. Presented as it is, the argument is practically sleight of hand: the union is an extreme case of mixture, where one of the ingredients is not initially there. This is still, then, an argument from within the same paradigm as Sergios. It is still groping for a category to express mixture without confusion. It is still understanding the incarnation as a “union” which can somehow be statically expressed rather than an activity.

So how is Severos able to solve this breakdown of communication? I will suggest that he is really only able to communicate his positive understanding of the incarnation as it is unpacked *not* as yet another, more subtle, model of mixture, but as an *activity*, specifically a soteriological activity, of God the Word. That would be if one were describing it as a Christology from above. As a Christology from below, what Severos needs to do is give an account not simply of the preservation of the integrity of the assumed humanity, nor simply a denial of its independence, but a positive understanding of its role and function in the union, of how it relates to the divine nature. Put differently, by his denials—that is not a mixture, not a confusion—Severos shows that he does not understand the incarnation in event terms. But he then has to find a way of expressing and defending it in other than event categories. I shall try to suggest that he manages this, and that it is with the help of Gregory the Theologian.

Severos, in his *First Letter to Oecumenius*, makes use of Cyril’s

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. p. 110.15-18; PG 76.1450A (Latin only); for the Syriac, cf. Severos: *Philalethes*, p. 140.14-21.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. p. 111.4-13.

illustration of the coal: "God the Word was united to the manhood, without casting off being that which he is, but rather changed what had been assumed or united into his glory and operation."<sup>13</sup> Against this, Severos contrasted the position of Leo: "Each of the natures preserves its own property without diminution."<sup>14</sup> To Severos, Leo's move, though well intentioned, is a preservation of the humanity in the wrong aspect. They are operating within different paradigms. He allows that the particularity of the natures (ἰδιότης ὡς ἐν ποιότητι φύσεως) of which Emmanuel consists, remains constant and fixed, but God the Word did not permit his flesh *in all things* to undergo the passions proper to it, so that its property might be preserved *undiminished*, as the impious Leo maintained.

What Severos has done here is shift his attention from the mode of union understood in event language to the role or function of the humanity once it is assumed. He is addressing a different agenda, and now arguing from within a different paradigm. There is a right way for the humanity *to be changed* (i.e. into the glory of the Word), and a wrong way. Similarly, there is a right way for the particularity in nature of the humanity to be preserved, and a wrong way.

What is it, then, that determines whether change or preservation is right or wrong? Severos again draws on Cyril: "What you say is a mean thing, this he did voluntarily for your sake. He wept in human fashion, that he might take away your weeping. He feared by dispensation, inasmuch as he sometimes permitted his flesh to undergo the passions proper to it, that he might make us valiant."<sup>15</sup> The union is here no longer portrayed as being an end in itself, with the puzzle being the academic one of finding the right category to express the union of two natures of different kind. Instead, the union is perceived as being dispensatory, its entire course or history being to bring about human salvation. Thus, it is not a single event, but a doing, an activity of God the Word.

And here, crucially, Severos quotes from Gregory the Theologian: "He is purity itself, and did not need purification, but he is purified

---

<sup>13</sup>*Patrologia Orientalis* (Turnhout, Belgium, 1973), Vol 12, Fascicle 2, p. 180.11-13; Cyril, *Scholia* 9 (Pusey edn. Vol 6) p. 516.3-5.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.* p. 182.5-7; Leo, *Ep. XXVIII*, Section 3, PL 54.765A.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.* p. 183.4-6; Cyril, *Apol. contra Theod.*, PG 76.441B-C (= Pusey edn. Vol 6, p. 476.11-12).

*for you . . . for he himself was a warden of passion to himself.*"<sup>16</sup> And then Severos, having found the metaphor and authority he needed, seized upon it, amplified it, and worked it into his own argument: "Thus, he was a warden to himself of hungering, as well as of being tired from a journey . . . in order to display the humanization truly and without phantasy."<sup>17</sup>

I want to suggest that this is the heart of Severos' Christology. It is a far cry from using the union of body and mind to illustrate the incarnation. Severos is here no longer operating within the paradigm of an event union. In a way which is surprisingly modern, he understands the incarnation as being active, dynamic, purposive, thus relating together incarnation and atonement. This was a different paradigm from that of his opponents. It was difficult for him to express, but in the notion of the Word as *warden* of suffering to himself, I suggest that Severos found a serviceable metaphor. He builds upon Cyril, but the crystalization of his Christology is from Gregory.

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. p. 185.4-7; Gregory the Theologian: *Oratio* 40, *In Sanctum Baptisma*, PG 36.400C.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. p. 185.7-10.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Ritual of Conversion from Islam to the Byzantine Church

---

DANIEL J. SAHAS

A SHORT GREEK WRITING ENTITLED "ΤΑΞΙΣ ΓΙΝΟΜΕΝΗ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΙΣ ἀπὸ Σαρακηνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσι πρὸς τὴν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀληθὴ πίστιν ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν" ("Order followed for those of the Saracens who return to the pure and true faith of us Christians")<sup>1</sup> is attributed to Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155 - ca. 1215/6) the prominent civil servant of the Komnenian era. The Order has become known in Western scholarship as "Formula of abjuration." Indeed, the text is taken almost entirely by the ἀπόταξις, or "stepping aside" from the faith and practice in Islam, in the form of anathemas.<sup>2</sup> These anathemas are followed by a brief positive statement of the convert's σύνταξις, or "siding with" Orthodox Christianity. The text has received special notice because of the last anathema against "the God of Muhammad, of whom he [Muhammad] says that he is one God, ὁλόσφυρος [made of solid metal beaten to a spherical shape], who neither begat nor was begotten, and no-one has been made like him."<sup>3</sup> The peculiar wording of this anathema has obviously in mind, if it is not

---

<sup>1</sup> PG 140.124A-36C. Subsequently referred to as *Order*. The text in the *Patrologia Graeca* is from F. Sylburg's edition, *Saracenicæ sive Moamethicæ opera Friderici Sylburgii*, vet. ope bibliothecæ palatinae (Heidelberg, 1595), pp. 74-91.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Montet has published a critical edition of twenty anathemas against Islam, i. e. the ἀπόταξις, on the basis of three mss (*Palatinus* 233(P) of the 14th c., *Vindobonensis* 306 (V) also of the 14th c., and *Bruxellensis* (B) dated March 1st 1281), collated by Franz Cumont. These mss contain also similar "formulas of abjuration" of Judaism and Manichæism. Cf. "Un rituel d'abjuration des musulmans dans l'église grecque," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 53 (1906)145-63, at 145; text, pp. 148-55.

<sup>3</sup> PG 140.133A.



translation, *Sûrat al-Tawhîd*, or "The Unity," the Qur'ânic sûrah which proclaims the unity of God along with an implicit condemnation of the belief in a "Son" of God.

The anathema has obviously been inspired by the misunderstood Qur'ânic word *samad* meaning "the uncompounded one," and by its polemic manipulation which can be attributed to Niketas of Byzantium (842-912), the "philosopher," one of the most extreme Byzantine polemicists of Islam. The "scandalous" anathema itself, as Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180) saw it, as well as his desire "to placate the Muslims,"<sup>4</sup> prompted him to demand its deletion from the master *Catechesis* of Hagia Sophia and from all the catechetical books of the Church. His demand was met with an opposition from the Constantinopolitan synod of bishops during the last year of the Emperor's life (1180).<sup>5</sup> The anathema was finally modified to read "anathema to Muhammad and all his teachings." However, Choniates' version of the anathema, and possibly all other versions, remained unchanged; a sign that the uncompromising side in the debate prevailed.

Obviously this *Order* was not authored by Niketas himself, as Manuel blamed "former emperors and members of the hierarchy [as] thoroughly unbraided for being so stupid and thoughtless as to suffer the true God to be placed under anathema."<sup>6</sup> The date of this *Order* may be even placed as far back as in the middle of the ninth century,<sup>7</sup> if not in the end of the eighth century, the time when the

---

<sup>4</sup> Alexander Kazhdan and Giles Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, D. C., 1982), p. 148.

<sup>5</sup> With the development of the ὁλόφυρος and the twelfth-century controversy we have dealt in some detail in "Holosphyros? A Byzantine Perception of 'the God of Muhammad.'" Christian-Muslim Encounter. A Conference Sponsored by Hartford Seminary, June 1990, under publication. The source of the controversy is Niketas' History. Cf. *Nicetae Choniatae. Historia*. Recensuit Ioannes Aloysius van Dieten, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, vol. 11/1 (Berlin, 1975) pp. 213-22; translated as *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, by Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1984), pp. 121-25; subsequently referred to as Niketas' *Historia*. The two numbers indicate the page in von Dieten's edition and in Magoulias' translation, whenever this translation has been preferred. The controversy has been recorded also by other chroniclers. Cf. the *Σύνογος Χρονική* by an anonymous author, ed. N. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 7, pp. 303-07; and Dositheos Notaras, *Παραλειπόμενα ἐκ τῆς Ἱστορίας περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, vol. 1 [1891 (Bruxelles, 1963)] 247-49.

<sup>6</sup> Niketas, *Historia*, pp. 214/121; underlining added.

<sup>7</sup> Sylburg dates the text to the year 1152, and Cumont cites reasons why its date

reverence of the icons became a confirmed doctrine and practice of the Church.<sup>8</sup> "Formulas of abjuration" of Judaism and Manichaeism and, therefore, possibly of Islam as well, are dated in the end of the ninth century, during the Patriarchate of Photios (858-867, 877-886).<sup>9</sup>

The structure and content of this *Order* of conversion, or reconversion, from Islam to the Church reveal a process of development, resulting in a formal procedure. However, such a uniform and widely used text of abjuration presupposes widespread and frequent conversions from Islam to Christianity. This was not the order of the day in the eighth or early ninth century, except toward the end of the ninth and especially during the tenth century, after the Byzantines had scored some significant victories over the Arabs and had reclaimed some of the former Byzantine territories.

Niketas' version of the ritual of conversion allows us to reconstruct the process by which one was admitted, or re-admitted, to the Church. As it stands, this particular text does not compel us to assume conclusively that this *Order* is for those who become Christian for the first time, or for those who reconvert to the Church after they had apostasized. Its descriptive title, speaking of those "who return" to the Christian faith, as well as the fact that the text ends with the entrance of the initiate to the rank of the catechumens,<sup>10</sup> suggests that this *Order* may have been devised for reconverts. However, other aspects of its content suggest the opposite. The process of the ritual of conversion seems to include four stages.

The first stage consists of a two-week period of fasting, clearly as a way of penance and spiritual preparation. During this period the initiate is taught the Lord's prayer and the Creed as a minimum, but most essential, knowledge of the Christian faith; the former as a practical tool for prayer, and the latter as a succinct summary of

---

may be even much earlier. Franz Cumont, "Une formule grecque de renonciation au Judaïsme," in *Bormannheft der Wiener Studien* (24, Jahrg, 2., Heft), pp. 233-34; cf. Mondet "Un rituel," p. 146, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Montet, "Un rituel," p. 146-47.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Brinkmann, *Die Theosophie des Aristokritos* (Rhein. Mus LI), 1896, p. 273; and Franz Cumont, "La conversion des Juifs byzantins au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* 46 (1903) 8-15.

<sup>10</sup> PG 140.124B. To the *Order* Sylburg appends the service of the catechumens, and the process of induction, that is chrismation, communion, fasting, and final wash (ἀπόλουσις), from the *Euchologium patriarchale*, PG 140.123-26, note 3.

the Orthodox doctrine.

The second stage begins two weeks later. The initiate is brought in front of the baptistry in the presence of other faithful (acting perhaps as witnesses) and of the priest who is fully vested in his priestly vestments. This is potentially a significant detail. During the service of induction to the rank of the catechumens the normal practice is that the priest does not wear his full set of vestments. He does change, however, into a full set of white vestments for the sacrament of baptism.<sup>11</sup> So does he for the sacrament of marriage, indicative of the eucharistic character of these sacraments, which in the early Church took place during the liturgy. This information from the *Order* that the priest is fully vested points either to an earlier and different practice, or to the importance which the Church gave to conversion, or reconversion. Or, again, this detail may suggest that this *Order* was for reconverts who reaffirmed their baptism.

The initiate then makes in front of the baptistry a public declaration that he, or she, embraces Christianity "not as a result of compulsion, pressure, deceit or hypocrisy,<sup>12</sup> but wholeheartedly, and with a pure and innocent heart and soul that loves Christ and his faith." The initiate also makes the declaration that with his conversion he is severing himself from the religion of the Saracens, and anathematizes Islam in all its doctrines, beliefs, and practices. This long list of anathemas provides us with a most interesting picture of the perception that the Byzantine Church at the time had of Islam as well as of the things which the Church considered to be abominable and objectionable. The *Order* instructs that this declaration of intention and the anathemas must be recited, phrase by phrase, by the priest and be repeated or consented upon by the initiate, or by, or through, an interpreter "if he [the initiate] happens to speak no Greek"; or by the Godparent, if the initiate happens to be a child.<sup>13</sup> One may wonder how much a convert was able always to understand what he was renouncing and anathematizing!

The recitation of the anathemas was followed by petitions and prayers, as the *Order* has the deacon saying, "Let us pray to the Lord,"

---

<sup>11</sup>*Εὐχαλόγιον τὸ Μέγα*, ed. Sp. Zervos (reprint of the second edition, Venice, 1862; Athens, 1970), p. 136.

<sup>12</sup>PG 140.124A. The language here may imply real circumstances. Compare this to the Muslim preconditions of making the *shahâdah*. Cf. below, n. 53.

<sup>13</sup>PG 140.124B.

to which the people responded with the "Lord, have mercy," followed by other standard liturgical components.<sup>14</sup> After the "Amen" the priest sealed the initiate. This could be a blessing and sealing of the initiate with the sign of the cross, or something similar, rather than the sacrament of chrismation, since no baptism had yet taken place.<sup>15</sup> With this act the second stage of conversion was completed, and the person "from the next day is numbered among the catechumens."<sup>16</sup>

The *Order* does not make it clear whether baptism followed immediately after this service. In fact, its particular wording suggests that baptism was taking place at a later time. The Patriarchal Euchologion specifies that the catechumens must fast for ten or fifteen days and occupy themselves with prayers morning and evening, learning hymns.<sup>17</sup> The third stage, therefore, seems to be the period of catechesis itself, during which the person is instructed on matters of faith and practice and is prepared for baptism. Baptism, then, and chrismation constitute the fourth and final stage of a convert's incorporation into the Church. This is the procedure suggested, although not fully articulated, by Niketas' version of the *Order*.

One other source of information on a similar ritual is the Διάταξις, or Ἀκολουθία (Order of Service) of Methodios, the iconophile confessor Patriarch of Constantinople (843-847), entitled "Ἀκολουθία περὶ τῶν ἀπ' ἀρνήσεως διαφόρων προσώπων καὶ ἡλυσῶν, πρὸς τὴν Ὀρθόδοξον καὶ ἀληθὴ πίστιν ἐπιστρέφόντων" ("Order about those various persons and ages who have denounced and are returning to the Orthodox and true faith").<sup>19</sup> Although the title of this service speaks of "various persons and ages" and does not specify these persons, it is reasonable to assume that at the time of Methodios, such persons,

<sup>14</sup>"καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς." PG 140.124B.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. *Euchologium patriarchale*, PG 140.126C (note).

<sup>16</sup>PG 140.124B; underlining added.

<sup>17</sup>PG 140.125B.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. also Jean Ebersolt, "Un nouveau manuscrit sur le rituel d'abjuration des musulmans dans l'Église grecque," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 53 (1906) 231-32.

<sup>19</sup>Jacobus Goar, *Euchologion sive rituale Graecorum* (Graz, 1960; reprinted from the second edition, Venice, 1730), pp. 689-92; hereafter referred to as Ἀκολουθία. PG 100.1299-1325, with comments by Goar. The same order also, in Alexander Cangelarius ed., *Εὐχολόγιον* (1740), pp. 373-77; and in Sp. Zervos ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Venice, 1851), pp. 588-94.

more so than pagans, Jews, or Manichaeans were Muslims, and the religion in favor of which they had denounced their Christian faith was Islam. One can also assume that the Church was more familiar with people who had converted to Islam once and then returned to Christianity, rather than with Muslims directly converting to Christianity. With its phenomenal expansion during the first one and a half centuries after the death of Muhammed, Islam had had the upper hand over the Byzantines whose territories and Christian population had subjugated.

Conversions, mainly for social and economic reasons, were taking place from Christianity to Islam, rather than the other way. Also, Islam treated apostasy as a capital offense. Not only in *Dâr al-Harb* (the land of war, or contested territories), but even in the *Dâr al-Islam* (the land governed by Islam), Muslims preferred to live in areas where Muslims were the majority and Muslim law prevailed, separately from "infidels," in order to avoid any possible temptation to apostasize.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, reconversion of Islamized persons to Christianity was desirable and, indeed, actively pursued by the Byzantine Church as, for example, the later missionary activities of Saint Nikon the "Metanoicite" (d. 998) among the Cretans, after the reconquest of Crete from the Arabs (961), indicate.<sup>21</sup>

Methodios of Constantinople outlines different procedures for readmission to the Church for three different categories of converts:

The first category are children, who were captured and denounced their faith out of fear, naivité, or ignorance. For such children Methodios prescribes prayers for seven days. On the eighth day, the children are to be washed, chrismated, and given a set of new clothes, as newly baptized, without however being rebaptized.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (New York, 1982), p. 67. Cf. also a number of studies on the subject of conversion in Michael Gervers and Ramzi J. Bikhazi eds., *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries* (Toronto, 1990), especially those by Richard W. Bulliet, "Conversion Stories in Early Islam," pp. 123-33, and Michael G. Morony, "The Age of Conversion: A Reassessment," pp. 135-50.

<sup>21</sup>*The Life of Saint Nikon*. Text, Translation and Commentary by Denis F. Sullivan (Brookline, Mass., 1987), where further bibliography on the subject may be found. Cf. also Vasilios Christides, *The Conquest of Crete by the Arabs (ca. 824). A Turning Point in the Struggle between Byzantium and Islam* (Athens, 1984).

<sup>22</sup>In the *Εὐχολόγιον*, there is a brief prayer "Ἐπὶ ἀποσταάντι ἐκ παιδιότητος, ἡγουν μακαρίσαντι, καὶ μετανοοῦντι" ("For someone who has apostasized from childhood, that is, has been defiled, and is now repenting"). Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, pp. 693-94. Such

The second category are young or older people, who denounced their faith under torture. Such persons should fast "for two Lents,"<sup>23</sup> during which they should offer prayers and perform prostrations. Close to the end of the two Lents, prayers are to be offered for eight days, while the converts should repeat the "*Κύριε, ἐλέησον*" one hundred times a day. Then they are to be washed, chrismated, and be given communion, as those who are baptized. They too, however, ought not to be rebaptized.

The third category are those who have become renegades willingly. These are to be received back, but not be allowed to receive communion ever, except at the end of their life, according to the 73rd canon of Saint Basil.<sup>24</sup>

Those returning to the Church were received, "in the order of those who are baptized"<sup>25</sup> or according to codex Barberinus, "in the order which has been established for the newly illuminated ones,"<sup>26</sup> by being given a new set of clothes.<sup>27</sup> These are *τὰ ἐμφώτια* (lit., "the garments of illumination"), as Gregory the Theologian had called them earlier in his oration "On the holy Baptism,"<sup>28</sup> or *ἱμάτια καινὰ* ("the clothes of newness," or simply "new clothes") as Methodios calls them now. The name also "*ἐμφώτιος ἐσθῆς*," which is found in the fourth century literature, disappears gradually. Its last reference is found between the years 600-629.<sup>29</sup> However, the practice itself continues, as Methodios' descriptive name (*ἱμάτια καινὰ*) shows. In fact, the practice was adopted by Muslims for their own

---

a person is received by chrismation.

<sup>23</sup>It is not clear whether the expression means for two years, or for two Lenten periods, Christmas and Easter, in the same year.

<sup>24</sup>"Whoever has denied Christ and has violated the Mystery of salvation ought to weep through the rest of his life, and he owes the obligation as a debt to acknowledge and confess the fact at the time when he is about to pass out of this life, when he shall be deemed to deserve the right to partake of the Holy Elements, by faith in the kindness bestowed upon human beings by God." D. Cummings, *The Rudder* (Chicago, 1957), p. 834; cf. also the eleventh canon of the First Ecumenical Council, in *ibid.* p. 180.

<sup>25</sup>PG 100.1300A-01A.

<sup>26</sup>PG 100.1300, n. (5).

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Ph. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός* vol. 4 (Athens, 1951), p. 51, and n. 4.

<sup>28</sup>*Oration* 40; PG 36.360B-425D, at 393C.

<sup>29</sup>Koukoules, 4, p. 52.

converts, especially prominent converts, to Islam.<sup>30</sup>

The choice of words in the six Εὐχαί 'Ιλαστικαί (prayers of expiation) in Methodios' service reveals the attitude of the Byzantine Church towards the denunciation of one's faith: the first of these prayers talks about "deviation from [God's] commandments" and "deliverance of oneself to death"; of an "evil destruction" and of "death" from which mankind was saved by the incarnation of the Lord.<sup>31</sup> The second prayer speaks of the Church as the means through which sins are held or forgiven, and asks that God may receive the servant who returns from "the way of error" and repents.<sup>32</sup> With the third prayer the Church prays that the servant of God whom God "saved from the captivity of the godless enemies" be "united to the society of his people," that God may illuminate his mind, inflame the spark of baptism in him, "keep away his mind from every habit of pagan atheism" and make him sharer of his mysteries.<sup>33</sup> The fourth prayer prays that the person who has lapsed either because of [physical or spiritual] "infancy" or of any other "adventure" (περιπέτεια), be received as the "prodigal son" within the flock of the reasonable sheep.<sup>34</sup> The fifth prayer prays that the "lost sheep" be accepted back to the flock and be protected from "the wolves by which he had been caught." Immediately after this prayer the convert is chrismated as a newly baptized person. The last prayer prays that the person who "has returned from the way of error" be guided to the faith and the fragrance of the Holy Spirit "and become worthy of receiving the holy communion."

Methodios' service and the various categories of converts has a

<sup>30</sup>We have here in mind the case of Samuel al-Maghribî (c. 1130-1175), a prominent Jewish mathematician and physician born in Baghdād who lived in Iraq and Iran. His conversion was not even preceded by a period of catechesis or indoctrination. Samuel himself in the second part of his *Iḥṣām al-'ahūd* ("Silencing the Jews") which is, actually, his autobiography, describes his conversion: he decided to become a Muslim after he had experienced a series of visions and dreams. On the day of his induction a new suit of clothes was hastily prepared for him and he was then brought to the Mosque. "The judge," writes Samuel, "delivered a sermon, speaking at length in my praise . . . For the most part the assembly was occupied with myself." Moshe Perlmann, "Samuel al-Maghribî and his Anti-Jewish Tractate," "Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter," 25. Wolfenbütteler Symposion. Wolfenbüttel, 11-15 June, 1989, under publication.

<sup>31</sup>*Εὐχολόγιον*, ed. Zervos, pp. 589-90.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 590-91.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 591-92.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 592-93.

precedent in Timotheos, a presbyter of the church of Constantinople and (σπουδαῖς) of the Church of the Theotokos in Chalkopratis who, in about 622,<sup>35</sup> wrote a treatise under the title "Περὶ τῶν προσερχομένων τῇ ἁγίᾳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ" ("Regarding those who are coming into the holy Church").<sup>36</sup> Timotheos divides those who proceed, or actually return, to the Church into three categories: those who have to be baptized; those who are not to be baptized, but only chrismated; and those who are to be neither baptized nor chrismated, but admitted to the Church by denouncing every heresy, including their own.<sup>37</sup> He then proceeds to name the heresies which fall into each of these three categories and to give a brief description of them and of their splinter groups.<sup>38</sup> In the first category belong, among others, the Gnostics. The Arians, among others, are placed in the second; and the Nestorians, among others, in the third category! One may wonder whether, on the basis of this order, a controversialist who considered Islam to be an Arian heresy would have recommended chrismation, while if he considered Islam to be a Nestorian heresy would have recommended neither baptism nor chrismation for a Muslim wanting to become a Christian! In fact, various opinions existed among early Byzantine anti-Islamic polemicists as to the nature of Islam as it becomes evident from the writings of the earliest controversialists.<sup>39</sup>

The Byzantine Church must have been faced at some time with the dilemma as to whether it was possible for Timotheos' formula to be applied to Muslims who wanted to become Christians. And it is at such a junction, as to how the Church should receive converts or reconverts from Islam,<sup>40</sup> that Methodios' canon could have come as a clarification. We must see Methodios' service as a development of Timotheos' treatise, and in response to receiving apostates who had apostatized as a result of the Muslim conquests.

<sup>35</sup>Cotelerius, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae*, vol. 3, p. 626; PG 86/I.9-10, n. (b).

<sup>36</sup>PG 86/I.12-68D.

<sup>37</sup>PG 86/I.69A-72A.

<sup>38</sup>He repeats this list in a summary form in a letter of his to a certain John, whom he calls "most beloved of God, co-celebrant, and dearest one to me of everybody else." PG 86/I.69A-73B. Who is this John is not made clear, but the address does not sound to be one of a presbyter, to another presbyter!

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Daniel Sahas, "John of Damascus on Islam. Revisited," *Abr-Nahrain* 23 (1984-85), p. 108.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Jean Guillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclasme," *Byzantion* 21(1961) pp. 378-79. Repr. in his *La vie religieuse à Byzance* (London, 1981) # 6.



The centrality of Methodios in matters of conversion can be testified to by yet another evidence. Appended to *Θησαυρός Ὁρθοδοξίας* chapter 20, where the *Order* is included, and as a kind of supplement to it, there is a brief text entitled "Περὶ τῆς καινοφανοῦς αἰρέσεως τῶν Λιζικιανῶν" ("Regarding the newly-appeared heresy of the Lizikians");<sup>41</sup> a text which Jean Guillard<sup>42</sup> has identified as an authentic fragment of the *Life of Methodios*<sup>43</sup> by Gregory Asbestas, Methodios' friend and archbishop of Syracuse (d. 880). The inclusion of these two texts, the *Order* and that on the reconversion of the Lizikians, in the same chapter of the *Θησαυρός*, may suggest that it was a common procedure that was followed for the Lizikians returning from Manichaeism and for converts to Islam who were returning to the Church, namely, abjuration, chrismation and dressing with baptismal clothes. Furthermore, as Guillard suggests, these texts point to the rising phenomenon of reconciliation of apostates with the Church, something which was hardly known before the ninth century.<sup>44</sup> Also, of the very few writings which are known to be of Methodios there exists a letter addressed to the Patriarch of Jerusalem entitled, "Ἐπὶ καθαίρεσι τῶν ἀποστησάντων ἱερέων" ("Regarding excommunication of priests who have apostasized [to iconoclasm]").<sup>45</sup> This is a further evidence of Methodios' particular interest in canonical matters regarding apostates, from either the faith or the Orthodox doctrine of Christianity, on which he provides us with an early and valuable information. The fact that the phenomenon of reconciliation of apostates with the Church takes place during the time of Methodios and it is connected with his name, points to an active pastoral role which this moderate ecclesiastic played on this matter.

The possible connection between the defeat of iconoclasm, as a multi-heretical and a multi-religious phenomenon,<sup>46</sup> and the return

<sup>41</sup>PG 140.281D-284A.

<sup>42</sup>"Deux figures," pp. 371-401.

<sup>43</sup>PG 100.1244-61.

<sup>44</sup>"Deux figures," pp. 378-79.

<sup>45</sup>PG 100.1292C-93B. This must be his contemporary John VI, Patriarch of Jerusalem (838-842). Obviously, Methodios wrote this letter before he became Patriarch of Constantinople in 843.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. Leslie W. Barnard, *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (Leiden, 1974). Cf. also Daniel J. Sahas *Icon and Logos. Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm* (Toronto, 1988) *in passim*, for the treatment

of apostates to the Church is another interesting, obscure and largely speculative matter, which can add another dimension to the ongoing discussion over the causes and the character of Byzantine iconoclasm. One may wonder as to whether some of those living on the extremities of the Empire, or some nominal Christians or Christians by convention, had not become through the iconoclastic teachings so attuned to Paulicianism, Manichaeism, Judaism, and Islam that for them converting to any one of these religions had not appeared to be a "natural" routine, or unconscious transition in their life.

Niketas' version of the ritual of conversion shows a striking similarity in procedures, words and spirit with another ritual of conversion, from Judaism to Christianity.<sup>47</sup> One may find ample evidence to suggest that conversion from Islam to Christianity adopted texts and modified existing procedures of conversion from Judaism or from other religious communities. For example, the eighth canon of the Second Council of Nicea (787) stipulates that Jews, who do not accept the Christian faith honestly and sincerely, pretending only to be Christians but otherwise continuing their Jewish customs and practices, should not be admitted to the Church, nor should they be allowed to own a slave, neither themselves nor their children.<sup>48</sup> As conversion from one religion to another was taking place at times for superficial or for reasons of expediency, the requirement for a public declaration of one's sincerity became obligatory.<sup>49</sup> If seeking social status, or in order to marry a Christian were some of the reasons for converting to Christianity, another reason was in order to avoid a possible harsher punishment for a crime committed.<sup>50</sup> The explicit, sincere and conscientious acceptance of the Christian faith is an absolute prerequisite for admitting one to the Church. Marriage of a Jewish or Muslim woman to a Christian man does not make her

---

of iconoclasm by the Second Council of Nicea (787) as a doctrinal thesis restating previous Christological heresies.

<sup>47</sup>*Εὐχολόγιον*, ed. Zervos, pp. 672-78; and a shorter one in Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, pp. 282-83.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. G. A. Rallis and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων* (Athens, 1852), 2, p. 583; subsequently referred to as *Σύνταγμα*.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. above. n. 12.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. to Chapter seven of Photius' *Νομοκάνων* which refers to Jews who seek to become Christians in order to avoid being punished for a crime, or paying back a loan. *Σύνταγμα* 1, p. 122.

automatically a Christian, as the response of the canonist Theodore Valsamon (d. 1199) to the 49th question of Mark, Patriarch of Alexandria, indicates; nor does marriage of a Christian to a non-Christian annul his or her baptism.<sup>51</sup> Thus, one notices on this point the similarity between the *Order* and an “Ἐκθεσις” or “Exposition” as to how the Church should accept the one who enters “the faith of the Christians from the [religion of the Jews],” found in the *Euchologion*. This “Exposition” begins with the following characteristic statement:

He who proceeds from the religion of the Jews to a life as a Christian, must first denounce every lawful Jewish practice and thus demonstrate that he wants to live as a Christian with all his soul and heart and sincere faith; he must renounce manifestly in front of the Church [congregation] everything pertinent to the Jewish religion and all the ancient practices [or precepts] of the law. He must also anathematize all the practices and customs which were invented subsequently and are in variance with the will of God. The priest will speak first and the one to be baptized, or his sponsor (if he happens to be a child or speaks some other language) will respond.<sup>52</sup>

One can hardly miss noticing the striking similarity between this introductory directive and the equivalent one in Niketas' *Order*.

The Muslim community also faced early the situation of superficial conversions for reasons of fear or social expediency. Since the mere making of the confession of faith (*shahâdah*), that is, reciting the *kalima* (the “word,” i.e. *lâ ilâha ill' Allâh, Muhammadun rasûl al-lâh*, “There is no deity but God, Muhammad is the apostle of God”) would make one a Muslim, Muslim theologians and jurists imposed the following preconditions for the recital of the *shahâdah* to be considered valid: to be repeated aloud; to be perfectly understood; to be believed in the heart; to be professed till death; to be recited correctly; to be professed and declared without hesitation!<sup>53</sup>

Beyond the pastoral interest of the Church in bringing back to the flock those who had converted to Islam, the Byzantines were also interested in converting Muslims to Christianity, especially prominent

<sup>51</sup> Σύνταγμα 3, p. 484.

<sup>52</sup> Εὐχολόγιον, pp. 451-55.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Arthur Jeffery, ed., *Islam. Muhammad and His Religion* (Indianapolis, 1958),

Muslims; so were the Muslims. For the Byzantines, conversion was seen, among others, as a way of easing and eventually ending the conflict with the Arabs. Thus, the narrator of the preface to Emperor John Cantacuzenos' (1341-1355) "Four Apologies against the Mohammedan sect"<sup>54</sup> expresses his disappointment because conversions of prominent Muslims do not happen frequently "so as to ease the war of our nation."<sup>55</sup> Much earlier, Emperor Manuel I Komnenos who had ordered the deletion of the anathema "of the God of Muhammad" had hoped precisely for that. Byzantine orators, some of whom were even ideologically opposed to Manuel, have praised him for striving to fill the sheep yard of the Church with those who live apart, giving birth to many more children to his nation "like another Abraham";<sup>56</sup> a direct inference, perhaps, to Muslims who believe themselves to be the descendants and the continuators of the *din Ibrahim*, the religion of Abraham.

In the long and largely obscure history of conversion of Muslims to the Church, there are only few texts which allow us a glimpse into the order of the ritual. For such conversions the Church inherited earlier models used for admitting non-Christians, or heretics, to its fold. From such models the Church developed a more articulate order of admitting Jews. This process was further elaborated and developed to include Muslim converts and reconverts to Christianity. As the process and its ritual became more elaborate, so the requirements of conversion were hardened. The evolution of the process and the development of the ritual seem to have progressed through three distinct stages, marked by the evidence of Timotheos the presbyter, Patriarch Methodios of Constantinople, and the unknown source of Niketas Choniates.

<sup>54</sup>PG 154.372-584.

<sup>55</sup>PG 154.372B.

<sup>56</sup>K. G. Bonis, "'Ο Θεσσαλονίκης Ευστάθιος καὶ οἱ δύο "Τόμοι" τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Μανουὴλ Α' Κομνηνοῦ (1143/80) ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὴν Χριστιανικὴν Ὀρθοδοξίαν μετισταμένων Μωαμεθανῶν," *Ἐπετηρὶς Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 19(1949) 162-69; and his, *Εἰδωμὶον τοῦ Μαλάκη, μητροπολίτου Νέων Πατρῶν (Ῥάτης) (δεύτερον ἡμῶν β' ἑκατοντ.)*. *Τὰ σωζόμενα. Τεῦχος Β' Δύο Ἐγκωμιαστικοὶ Λόγοι, νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενα. Εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Μανουὴλ Α' τὸν Κομνηνόν, 1143/80* (Athens, 1949), 1, p. 526.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

in a therapeutic sense" (p. 50) — not as in the West, with the idea of mortification of the flesh. Fasting, in ascetic practice, offers the opportunity for restoration of human perfection and is a positive means by which negative human elements are eliminated. Again, the true aim is the restoration of the human being to full communion with God.

Though Father Akakios discusses the relations of the Traditionalist Orthodox to the mainstream Orthodox in Greece and in North America and their competing jurisdictions, especially in terms of the observation of their fasting practices, these pages should be read constructively and in an irenic spirit as suggestions for preserving traditional Orthodox practice.

*Fasting in the Orthodox Church* is a book that should be carefully examined and put to positive use. It is an excellent contribution to a better understanding of a much misunderstood subject.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine.* By Yiannis E. Meimaris (Athens, 1986). Pp. 292, soft.

*The Monastery of Saint Euthymios the Great at Khan et-Ahmet, in the Wilderness of Judaea.* Idem (Athens, 1989). Pp. 120, soft.

Rare are the scholars so qualified to carry on research and write books like these two under review. Excellently trained in ancient (Greek, Hebrew, Arabic) and modern languages, in paleography, theology, archeology, and philosophy, Dr. Yiannis E. Meimaris has produced first rate scholarship of interest to students of early Christianity, church history, Eastern monasticism, and hagiology. He is a charismatic researcher who has also prepared the Catalogue of the new Arabic manuscripts of Saint Katherine's Monastery of Mount Sinai, discovered in a crypt of the Monastery in 1975.

The first volume under review was published under the aegis of the Research Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, volume two in its *Meletemata* (studies). Based on his doctoral thesis at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the book's purpose is to present the life of the church in Byzantine Palestine as it appears in epigraphical material which has survived

in the form of Greek inscriptions. Chronologically they fall between the fourth and the seventh centuries and they refer to saints, martyrs, church officials, and sacred names. The content of the inscriptions is analyzed in the light of historical and theological literature of the period and of contemporary scholarship.

Though current excavations bring to light new inscriptions, the value of the present volume remains ever useful. The inscriptions in particular clarify obscure accounts and references in theological, historical, literary and legal sources such as the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebios, Sozomenos, and Sokrates, the Acts of Ecumenical Synods, the codes of Theodosios and Justinian, and Lives of Saints. With very few exceptions these inscriptions were written in Greek and are also of linguistic and cultural interest. Furthermore, they enrich our knowledge of Byzantine Palestine's church history, especially the history of the bishopric of Jerusalem and the metropolitan see of Caesarea.

Following an outline of the history of the church in Byzantine Palestine, in part two, the author collects all the inscriptions which use and apply the word *hagios*. The third part provides the history of church administration, the origins and functions of clerical and monastic orders and offices. Part four is devoted to the epigraphical evidence. The epithet *hagios* is used in a number of contexts: seven times to refer to God as Holy Trinity, God (Father), One God, Lord, I Am, Father, Most High, and Almighty. Several sacred names are used for Jesus Christ: Jesus, INBI, Christ, Son, Lord, Savior, God, Lamb of God, and Emmanuel.

The person of the mother of Christ is referred to with a variety of names. Very frequently she is called Hagia Maria. Other names include Theotokos, Parthenos (Virgin), Despoina (Sovereign Lady), Aeiparthenos (Ever-Virgin), Keharitomene (Full of Grace), and Ahrantos (Undefined).

Old and New Testament personalities, confessors, and martyrs are also named in the inscriptions. Of geographical interest is the reference to several holy places including the Church of the Resurrection and the Church of the Ascension. Perhaps more original and of more interest is the number of inscriptions referring to clerical and monastic orders and offices as they relate to the birth, formation, and development of church administration in Palestine.

The inscriptions were executed in wall paintings, graffiti, mosaics, or cut in marble and in local stone and wood. They are transcribed

in their original form in capital letters followed by the author's comments on their condition and meaning. They were found in a large number of sites which apparently were densely populated with both civilian and monastic population and reveal the "astonishing prosperity of Byzantine Palestine."

In his brief but comprehensive epilogue, Dr. Meimaris reminds us that "the majority of the early churches [in Byzantine Palestine] were dedicated to the Virgin Mary" and that the "monks of Palestine made important contributions to the hymnography and liturgy of the church." The nature and the onomatology of the inscriptions reveal "the dominance of Greek Christian culture and of the Greek language in particular during this period in Palestine." Furthermore, "the textual richness of Greek inscriptions" is augmented with "numerous ancient compound and theophoric Greek names," such as Agathonikos, Aiglou, Alexandros, Antiochos, Arion, Genesios, Diodoros, Dionysios, Irenaios, Elladis, Elphidios, Theodosios, Dorotheos, Theophanes, Theophilos, Timotheos, Filetos, and many more.

Anyone writing the history of the Christian movement and Church in the early Byzantine Empire cannot ignore this rich and illuminated research and evidence.

Dr. Meimaris' second volume is a preliminary report of rescue excavations he conducted in the wilderness of Judea between 1976-1979 in search of the monastery of Saint Euthymios the Great as related in the fascinating Kyrillos of Skythopolis, the writer of Palestinian monasticism and the biographer of the saint (A.D. 377-473). The ruins of the monastery were first surveyed by Derwas J. Chitty in 1928-30. The monastery had survived several catastrophes, both human and natural, until "the dreadful persecutions against the Christians of Syria and Palestine during the 14th century" (p. 209) when most probably it was left in permanent ruins — though it is mentioned in several *proskynetaria* (pilgrims' accounts) down to the eighteenth century. The 1928-30 excavations of the ruined monastery remained incomplete. Following the 1967 war between Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, the West Bank of Jordan came under Israeli occupation, including the area of the ruined monastery which was chosen by the Israeli Government for urban development.

Dr. Meimaris conducted his work on behalf of the Israeli Department of Antiquities and Museums and was assisted by students of the École Biblique, the Tantur Ecumenical Institute, the Studium



Biblicum Franciscanum, and several volunteers.

The importance of Dr. Meimaris' excavations lies not only in the completion of Chitty's work but also in the discovery of eight tombs and a refectory of the monastery of a later period. The excavations of 1928-30 and 1976-79 have now identified the cell of the saint, the ground floor of the original house of prayer, a cistern, and a storehouse for wheat. The forty-five page text of the present book is followed by sixty pages of black and white and by seven pages of color figures, including details of mosaics (prothesis, south aisle), color paintings, and fragments of frescoes (of interest to art historians). The identification of the Khan el-Ahmar site with the monastery of Saint Euthymios agrees with the description provided by Kyrillos of Skythopolis.

Dr. Meimaris expects to publish in the future a more complete report of the excavated area which, no doubt, will add to our knowledge of monasticism in Byzantine Palestine. This type of work is extremely difficult and cannot be but the work of love and commitment.

*Demetrios J. Constantelos*  
Stockton College

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Saint Basil and Byzantine Hymnology

---

PETER KARAVITES

IN A PAPER TO BE PUBLISHED SOON, I ARGUE IN FAVOR OF THE WELL-known theory that the early Father of the fourth century Church, Gregory the Theologian, served as a “mine” for Byzantine hymnographers who composed hymns and canons between the end of the fifth century and the end of the tenth century A.D. Between these two dates occurred the main development of Byzantine hymnography by the great hymn composers of the Byzantine Church, who set the pattern for the saints’ liturgical festivals. This view, that Gregory’s discourses provided valuable material and inspiration for the hymnographers of Byzantium, was well-accepted although no systematic research had explored all the possible interactions between the early Fathers and the Byzantine hymnologists. Only some obvious similarities in the language of Gregory and a few hymns connected with three or four prominent holidays of the Church have been mentioned. It is my hope that my paper will expand greatly the vista of interconnections in the language and themes of many Eastern Christian holidays by stressing the discourses of Gregory. What has not been sufficiently noticed so far is that the Cappadocian Father Basil the Great has also frequently inspired the hymnologists and synaxarists, especially through his encomiastic speeches. This paper will focus on Basil’s five encomiastic discourses to show how and when they were used by the Byzantine hymnographers for the composition of their heortological hymns. Needless to say that these five encomiastic discourses may not exhaust the topic, leaving a distinct opportunity for further research into the subject.

The first of these encomiastic speeches deals with the martyr Ioulitta. Strictly speaking Basil's discourse on Ioulietta is the continuation of Basil's speech "On the Eucharist" (Περὶ Εὐχαριστίας). It consists of nine paragraphs, two of which are dedicated to the martyrdom of Ioulitta, while the rest continue Basil's thoughts On the Eucharist, the discussion of which seems to have started the day before (*ten pro-teraiān*). Basil apologetically explains that he had intended to speak in more detail about Ioulitta, but that his concern over leaving the discussion "On the Eucharist" unfinished compelled him to resume it after his brief digression.

His story of Ioulitta, who died as a martyr during the persecution of Diocletian, 303-304, is based on information supplied to him by eye-witnesses and others who had heard the story of her martyrdom from eye-witnesses.<sup>1</sup> Basil's statement seems to preclude any written material about Ioulitta's martyrdom. If such existed Basil did not know about it, nor has any one else revealed it. Thus Basil seems to be our earliest written source of Ioulitta's martyrdom, through a dreadful death that moves Basil to great praise for her courage.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately, the *Menaion* contains no hymns in honor of Ioulitta. The same day, July 30, the Church celebrates the memory of Silas, Silouanos, Kreskes, Epainetos, and Andronikos, all supposedly members of the Seventy Apostles, going back to the apostolic times. The hymnology of the day, therefore, deals almost exclusively with these apostles. The only exception is in the synaxarion which is always located after the Kontakion and Oikos. From the information of the synaxarion we are led to believe that the information of Ioulitta's synaxarion derives from Basil's text. This view is supported by the fact that the text of the single biographical paragraph making up the synaxarion—actually less than one fifth of Basil's two paragraphs—adheres very closely to the language of Basil. It becomes obvious then that Basil—like other early Fathers of the Church—

<sup>1</sup> Πᾶσαν ἐκπλήξιν ἐμποιοῦσαν τοῖς τότε παροῦσι τῷ θεάματι καὶ τοῖς εἰς ὕστερον ἐκ τῆς τῶν πεπειραμένων διηγήσεως δεχομένοις τὴν ἀκοήν, Panayiotēs Chrestou (ed.), *Ἑλλήνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Thessalonike, 1973), 7, p. 202. Hereafter, EPE. Most of the references in this paper are in Vol. 7 where Basil's encomiastic discourses are located.

<sup>2</sup> M. Galanos, *The Lives of the Saints*, May-August (Athens, 1950), pp. 119-20 confuses this Ioulitta with another, a widow to whom Basil had written a letter and about whom he had written two letters, one addressed to count Helladios and the other to the sponsor of the widow's heirs, EPE, 7, p. 16, notes 8-11.

served as a source of the synaxaria of the Church saints as well as a source of Byzantine hymnography.<sup>3</sup>

Basil's second encomiastic discourse deals with the martyr Barlaam. This is also a brief discourse delivered on the anniversary of the martyr's death.<sup>4</sup> Many earlier scholars ascribe this discourse to J. Chrysostom, but more recent scholars, correctly I believe, accept it as a genuine speech by Basil.<sup>5</sup> On the basis of Basil's testimony, it is impossible for us to form a full picture of Barlaam's life and martyrdom. Basil does not give his place of origin or the date of his death. From other sources, however, we learn that he hailed from Antioch and died in Cappadocian Caesarea in the reign of Diocletian. Basil stresses Barlaam's lack of education and his stammering only to demonstrate his adherence to faith and his determination in the face of danger. His tomb was in Caesarea, but a church was built in his honor in Antioch. According to Church reports, he suffered many tortures rather than deny Christ and sacrifice to the idols. He refused to recant even when he was forced to stand before the altar holding in his right hand burning charcoals. This latter ordeal is dealt with not only by Basil but also by several of the hymns in the Byzantine hymnology. Thus for example, in chapter 3, Basil explains that,

Σίδηρος τῇ τοῦ πυρὸς εἵκει τυραννίδος χαυνούμενος, χαλκὸς τῇ

<sup>3</sup> Αὕτη ὥρμητο ἐκ πόλεως Καισαρείας τῆς Καππαδοκίας, ἦν καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος ἐγκωμίοις ἐτίμησε. Τοίνυν, δίκης αὐτῇ συνεστῶσης πρὸς τινα πλεονεκτικὸν ἄνδρα καὶ βίαιον ὃς, τῆς γῆς ταύτης τὸ πλεῖον ἀποτεμῶν, καὶ ἀγρούς, καὶ κώμας, καὶ βοσκήματα, καὶ οἰκέτας, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν τοῦ βίου κατασκευὴν, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν μετέστησε, καταφρονήσας τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ συκοφάντας καὶ ψευδομάρτυσι καὶ δωροδοκίαις τῶν δικαζόντων ἐπεριδόμενος. Ἐπειδὴ οὖν ἡ ἀδικουμένη αὕτη γυνὴ ἤρξατο ἀναδιδάσκειν τὴν τυραννίδα τοῦ ἄρπαγος, πάραυτα αὐτὸς διαβάλλει αὐτὴν ὡς Χριστιανήν, καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ ταύτην τῶν κοινῶν μετέχειν, ὡς μὴ λατρεύουσιν τοῖς τῶν βασιλέων θεοῖς. Ἡ δέ, πρὸς μηδὲν ἰδοῦσα τῶν παρόντων, ἀλλὰ πάντα καταφρονήσασα, Ἐρρέτω, εἶπεν, ὁ βίος καὶ ἡ τούτου δόξα· ἐγὼ γὰρ τῶν ἀπάντων Δημιουργὸν καὶ Κτίστην οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι. Τότε ὁ ἄδικος κριτὴς πυρὶ ταύτην παρέδωκεν. Ἡ δὲ κάμινος, περισχοῦσα τῆς Ἀγίας τὸ σῶμα ἀκέρατον διεσῶσατο τοῖς προσήκουσι, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστοῖς. Basil writes in Chapter 1, Δίκης γὰρ αὐτῇ πρὸς τινα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει δυνατῶν συνεστῶσης, πλεονεκτικὸν ἄνδρα καὶ βίαιον . . . ὃς γῆς τε πληθὺς ἀποτεμώμενος καὶ ἀγρούς καὶ κώμας καὶ κατασκευὴν, βοσκήματα καὶ οἰκέτας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περιούσαν τοῦ βίου ἐκ τῆς γυναικὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν μεταστήσας, κατελλήφει τὰ δικαστήρια, συκοφάνταις καὶ ψευδομάρτυσι καὶ δωροδοκίᾳ τῶν δικαζόντων ἐπεριδόμενος, etc.

<sup>4</sup> John Chrysostom had also delivered a speech on Barlaam which is somewhat longer but very general in meaning, see PG 50.675-82.

<sup>5</sup> J. Quasten, *Initiation aux pères de l'—Eglise*, trans. J. Laporte (Paris, 1936), 3, p. 316.

τοῦ πυρὸς παραχωρεῖ δυναστεία. . . . Ἄλλ' ὁ πάντα τοῦ πυρὸς  
βιαζόμενος τόνοσ, μάρτυρος τὴν δεξιὰν τεταμένην οὐκ ἔκαμψε  
κατακαίων.

Similarly, in chapter 3,

Τί σέ, ὦ γενναῖε τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατιώτα, προσεῖπω; Ἀνδριάδα  
καλέσω; Πολὺ σέ τῆς καρτερίας ἡλάττωσα. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πῦρ  
μαλλάτει δεξάμενον, σοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν ὀφθῆναι μόνον κινουμένην οὐκ  
ἔπεισεν. Ἄν σιδηροῦν ὀνομάσω καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς σῆς ἀνδρίας  
εὕρισκω λιπομένην εἰκόνα.

The first sticheron of the martyr in the vesper service deals with this theme,

Ἀνδριάντος στερρότερος, καὶ χαλκοῦ δυνατώτερος, καὶ σιδήρου  
γέγονας ἰσχυρότερος· παραχωρεῖ γὰρ τηκόμενον, καὶ θάττον  
λυόμενον, τούτων ἕκαστον πυρί, βίᾳ τούτου νικώμενον· σοῦ δὲ  
ἄκαμπος δεξιὰ τεταμένη τῶν ἀνθράκων. . . .

The composer of the hymn is not given, and the words of the hymn are in different grammatical form from that of Basil. But this is due to the hymnographer's need to adjust the language to the meter of the prosomoion. Had the composer written an idiomelon instead, he would have been freer to follow the language of Basil more closely, if he had wished to do so. Nevertheless, the presence of σίδηρος and χαλκός, as well as the παραχωρεῖ, δεξιὰ τεταμένη, πῦρ, and the expressions σίδηρος τῇ τοῦ πυρὸς εἵκει τυραννίδι, σιδήρου γέγονας ἰσχυρότερος, χαλκός τῇ τοῦ πυρὸς παραχωρεῖ δυναστεία, χαλκοῦ δυνατώτερος, point to the interchange of language between Basil and the composer who had Basil in mind when he wrote his hymn.<sup>6</sup> In chapter 2 Basil explains how τὰς τῶν νεύρων αἱ μάλιστα ἀρμονίαν παρέλυσαν, ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀκριβέστερον ἐπεσφίγγετο τόνοσ. In Ode Three, stanza one, the composer of the martyr's canon Theophanes uses the words, ἅπαξ τῆς σαρκὸς ὁ σύνδεσμος, καὶ ἡ ἀρμονία, σοῦ τῶν μελῶν διέλυστο, ἀλλ' ὁ τόνος διετηρεῖτο τῆς ψυχῆς ἀδιάρρηκτος. Basil's text and Theophanes' stanza carry the same meaning. Furthermore, the use of the words ἀρμονία and τόνοσ by the canon writer point to more than a simple

<sup>6</sup> *Menaion*, Nov. 19, p. 124, col. 1.

coincidence.<sup>7</sup>

In chapter 3 Basil states, 'Ἀνάστητέ μοι νῦν, ὦ λαμπροὶ τῶν ἀθλητικῶν κατορθωμάτων ζωγράφοι, τὴν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ κολοβωθεῖσαν εἰκόνα ταῖς ἡμετέραις μεγαλύνετε τέχναις. Ode Six, stanza two,<sup>8</sup> calls upon the painters to paint the martyr's icon, 'Ἀνάστητέ, οἱ καλοὶ νῦν ζωγράφοι τοῦ μάρτυρος, τὴν εἰκόνα, ταῖς ὑμῶν εὐτεχνίαις λαμπρύνετε . . . . Once again beyond the likeness in the simily, the use of identical words and forms ἀνάστητέ and ζωγράφοι, νῦν, εἰκόνα, ταῖς ὑμετέραις and ταῖς ὑμῶν clearly show the debt of Theophanes to Basil. Likewise, in chapter 2 of Basil's text we read πυρὸς εὐτονώτεραν δεξιὰν κεκτημένος while in Ode Seven, stanza three, we find the expression εὐτονώτεραν πυρὸς δεξιὰν κεκτημένος.<sup>9</sup> The same is true of Ode Four, stanza two where we read 'Ο τοῦ πυρὸς εὐτονώτεραν τὴν προαίρεσιν κεκτημένος.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps, had the hymnology for the martyr been longer, containing more idiomela in his honor, the linguistic similarities would have been greater. But it is comparatively short. The lauds, for example, are missing and so are the doxastica. Nevertheless, even in the limited number of hymns for the vesper service and the canon, the borrowings from Basil's language are obvious.

Still another early martyr of the Church on whom Basil delivered a discourse is Gordios. In this discourse Basil reports on the life and martyrdom of Gordios, and once again it appears that Basil had no written source in front of him but only oral reports as evidenced by the following two of Basil's statements: ἀμυδρὰ γὰρ τις φήμη πρὸς ἡμᾶς διεδόθη and ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα ὑπόμνησιν φέρουσα μάρτυρος, ἐπιφανῶς τοῖς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίοις ἐναθλήσαντος, εἴπωμεν ὅσα οἶδαμεν, where the italicized phrase may also denote only hearsay reports (Basil, chapter 2). Following the example of earlier orators Basil praises the martyr's place of origin, Cappadocian Caesarea, but avoid mentioning the name of the persecutor, exactly as he had done

<sup>7</sup> *Menaion*, Nov. 19, p. 125, col. 1. Theophanes lived in the ninth century A.D. For more details on his life and poetry see P. N. Trembelas, *Ἐκλογή Ἑλληνικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ὑμνογραφίας*, 2nd ed. (Athens, 1978), pp. 7, 33, 279, 290, 300, 321-28, 330, 370, 380; Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur*, 2nd ed., trans. G. Soteriades (Athens, 1974), 2, pp. 358, 564, 617; Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, in the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* (Munich, 1977), p. 571.

<sup>8</sup> *Menaion*, Nov. 19, 126, col. 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Menaion*, Nov. 19, p. 128, col. 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Menaion*, Nov. 19, p. 126, col. 1.

in the case of Ioulitta and the other martyrs to whom he had devoted encomiastic speeches. He simply calls the persecutor tyrant. Other sources identify the tyrant as Licinius and ascribe the persecution of Gordios to the year 314.<sup>11</sup> From Basil's speech we learn that Gordios came unexpectedly from the mountains where he had retired to live in isolation. Appearing in the hippodrome before the archon he courageously declared that he was a Christian. He was subsequently condemned to death and was killed outside the wall of the town, where it seems his tomb existed long after his death.<sup>12</sup>

The sudden arrival of Gordios is described by Basil as follows: Τότε δὴ γενναῖος ἐκεῖνος καὶ μέγας τὴν ψυχὴν, μέγας τὸ φρόνημα, ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῶν ὀρέων ἐπικαταβάς τῷ θεάτρῳ . . . ἀτρόμῳ τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ γαῦρῳ τῷ φρονήματι, οἰωνοὶ πέτρας συνεχεῖς . . . τοὺς τὸ στάδιον περικαθημένους παραδραμών, . . . βεβαιῶν τὸν λόγον, ὅτι «Δίκαιος ὡς λέων πέποιθε. The canon writer of Ode Five, stanza one, refers also to Gordios' sudden coming, ὑπείσελθὼν ἀτρόμῳ, καὶ ρωμαλέως ὡς λέων τὸ θέατρον, πέτρας ὥσπερ ἀψύχους.<sup>13</sup> Since there were no written sources prior to Basil's discourse, one is led to the conclusion that the inspiration of the canon writer was derived from Basil's text. This conclusion is further strengthened by the presence of certain words common to Basil and Theophanes, the composer of the canon, such as, ἀτρόμῳ (ἀτρόμῳ) τὸ θέατρον (τῷ θεάτρῳ), πέτρας and ὡς λέων in both places point to the same source and that source is Basil. The expression by Theophanes ὑπείσελθὼν ἀτρόμῳ and ρωμαλέως ὡς λέων τὸ θέατρον are too close in meaning and imagery to Basil's ἐπικαταβάς τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἀτρόμῳ τῇ καρδίᾳ . . . not to have been inspired by the reading of Basil's speech. Furthermore, Theophanes' πέτρα καθάπερ κύμα in Ode Five, stanza three, is too close to Basil's οἰωνεὶ πέτρας συνεχεῖς, . . . for us to pass it by.<sup>14</sup> The same is true of Basil's chapter 4, καὶ ὡς μᾶλλον ἐώρα τὴν καρδίαν ἀπτόητον, τοσοῦτῳ μειζρόνως ἐξηγηριούτο καὶ φιλονικώτερος ἦν νικῆσαι

<sup>11</sup> *Menaion*, Jan. 3, p. 29, col. 1; *Μέγα Ὁρολόγιον*, Jan. 3, the issue, place of publication, and year, as in the case of the Menaia, are not important. All editions follow the same sequel.

<sup>12</sup> For the possibility of another Gordios see Francois Halkin, "Un second saint Gordios," in *Analecta Bollandiana*, 76 (1961), pp. 5-15.

<sup>13</sup> Ὡς λέων in Basil is borrowed from Proverbs 28.1, but the odds are that the canonist uses it in the canon not because he knew it from the Bible, no doubt true, but because he found it here used by Basil in connection with Gordios.

<sup>14</sup> *Menaion*, Jan. 3, p. 25, col. 2.



τὴν ἔνστασιν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ τῶν ἀλγυνῶν. Ode Five, stanza three adverts also to the same idea, using Basil's key word ἔνστασιν. Lastly, Basil's Αὕτη ἐπεῖδεν ἡ ἡμέρα τὸ θαυμαστὸν ἐκεῖνο θέαμα, ὃ οὐκ ἡμαύρωσεν ὁ χρόνος, οὐδὲν ἐξέλυσεν ἡ συνήθεια . . . becomes by the hymnographer Αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα τὴν σὴν ἄθλησιν ἐπεῖδεν· ἦν οὐκ ἡμαύρωσεν ὁ χρόνος, οὐκ ἐκάλυψε λήθε, Ode Nine, stanza three.<sup>15</sup> It is unfortunate that Gordios's holiday is overshadowed by the holiday of Epiphany whose hymnography takes precedence; for otherwise (who knows!), there might have been more hymns dedicated to Gordios. In that case, we would have learned more about the hymnography's relation to Basil's discourse.

Basil, like Gregory the Theologian, delivered a discourse on Saint Mamas, the martyr. The discourse was delivered during a panegyric gathering of the people in honor of Mamas, whose memory seems to have been honored early by the Church and whose holiday seems to have been among the most important in the heortologion since both Fathers honored him with a short speech.<sup>16</sup> This discourse appears to have been given shortly after Basil's other discourse which bears the title "In the Beginning Was the Word," because of Basil's reference to the Arian schism (chapter 4).<sup>17</sup> Though the speech is dedicated to Mamas, Basil makes no mention to the type and circumstances of Mamas' martyrdom, and in this he follows the pattern of several of his encomiastic speeches. He starts his encomium with a simple reference to Mamas' pastoral profession and seizes the opportunity to advert to the great shepherds of history, Abel, Moses, Jacob, David, and so on. He likens the work of the shepherd to royal authority and points out that Christ is the true shepherd of the Christian flock. Basil then goes on to distinguish between the hired and non-hired shepherds since the former, in his view, are the shepherds who produce schisms in the Church.<sup>18</sup> Because of the absence of

<sup>15</sup>*Menaion*, Jan. 3, p. 31, col. 1.

<sup>16</sup>See Gregory Discourse No. 44, PG 36.608-21; H. Delehaye, *Les Origins du culte des Martyrs* (Brussels, 1933), p. 174; Anna Hatzenikolaou-Marava, *Ὁ Ἅγιος Μάμας* (Athens, 1953). In honor of Mamas there was a church in Caesarea built by Gallus and Julian, the latter the future emperor, when both were being trained in the area of Macellus; Anastasios Levides, *Ἱστορικὸν Δοκίμιον* (Athens, 1885), p. 65. Mamas' holiday is celebrated today on Sept. 2, not 4, as P. Chrestou mistakenly says in EPE, 7, p. 20.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.* p. 10.

<sup>18</sup>His reference is to the Arian and Anomoian leaders.

details in his discourse there is not much of a case between Basil and the hymnographers. Nonetheless, the composer of the doxasticon of the vesper aposticha must have had Basil's discourse in mind when he says, Δεῦτε συμφώνως οἱ πιστοὶ μνήμην τελέσωμεν Μάμαντος μάρτυρος· οὗτος γὰρ νέος Ἀβελ ἀνεδείχθη ἡμῖν· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ποιμὴν προβάτων γεγονώς ἀμνὸν εἰς θυσίαν πρῶτος προσήγαγε, καὶ στέφανον ἀθλήσεως, πρῶτος ἐχομίσατο . . . is clear reference Basil's Ἦκουσας ὅτι πρῶτος εὐαρεστήσας Ἀβελ ποιμὴν ὑπῆρξε. Not only the reference to *poimen*, a term which appears in the compositions for Mamas several times but also the νέος Ἀβελ ἀνεδείχθη ἡμῖν and the πρῶτος προσήγαγε and πρῶτος ἐχομίσατο seem to be clear references to Basil.<sup>19</sup> Theophanes' general statements in the canon as well as the references to Mamas as *poimen* could support the notion that Theophanes had read Basil's discourse on Mamas, as indeed he had, judging from his compositions on the other martyrs, but his descriptions are much too general for us to speak of linguistic similarities.

The Forty Martyrs whose martyrdom is celebrated by the Church on March 9 were all soldiers in the Roman army. They came from different parts of the empire, but they all served in the same military unit. They were killed in 320 A.D. owing to a decree by Licinius against the Christians at a time when Constantine and Licinius were in conflict, ending with the latter's death in Thessalonike in 325. Once again Basil does not give details about the martyrs' life, beyond their martyrdom, nor do we know the year of Basil's discourse.<sup>20</sup>

According to Basil, the martyrs were condemned to death by exposure to the winter cold in the Lake Sebasteia of Caesarea. In his speech Basil praises their adherence to the faith, their rejection of the official's (archon is the term used) blandishments, their contempt for glory and high offices, their defiance of threats and death, and their desire to join Christ. In this discourse, chapter 6, Basil presents the martyrs as saying, μὴ γὰρ ἱμάτιον ἀποδυόμεθα, ἀλλὰ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποτιθέμεθα. . . . Elsewhere in the same chapter Basil continues, δριμύς ὁ χειμὼν, ἀλλὰ γλυκὺς ὁ παράδεισος· ἀλγινὴ ἡ πῆξις,

<sup>19</sup>*Menaion*, Sept. 2, pp. 15-16, col. 2. The composer is probably Byzantios, though this is not by any means certain. For Byzantios see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, vol. 2, p. 554; Trembelas, *Ἐκλογὴ*, 89, pp. 260-61; Beck, *Kirche*, p. 472; 519; EPE, 7, pp. 278-80.

<sup>20</sup>Gregory of Nyssa has also written a discourse about the Forty Martyrs, see PG 45.749-56; 757-72; 773-78. See also S. N. Sakkos, *Οἱ Ἀγιοὶ Τεσσαράκοντα Μάρτυρες* (Athens, 1957); EPE, 7, p. 20.

ἀλλ' ἡδεῖα ἡ ἀνάπαυσις . . . Μικρὸν ἀναμείνωμεν, καὶ ὁ κόλπος ἡμᾶς θάλλει τοῦ πατριάρχου [Ἀβραάμ] . . . Μὴ ἐκκλείνωμεν, ὡ στρατιῶται. The first hymn of the martyrs in the stichos of the vesper service composed by John Monachos reads:<sup>21</sup> Μὴ γὰρ ἱμάτιον ἀποδυόμεθα<sup>22</sup> ἀλλὰ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποτιθέμεθα. Δριμύς ὁ χειμὼν, ἀλλὰ γλυκύς ὁ παράδεισος.<sup>23</sup> ἀλγινὴ πῆξις, ἀλλ' ἡδεῖα ἡ ἀπόλαυσις. Μὴ οὖν ἐκκλίνωμεν, ὡ στρατιῶται· μικρὸν ὑπομείνωμεν, ἵνα τοὺς στεφάνους τῆς νίκης ἀναδυσώμεθα. Obviously, John is following Basil's text.

Also in chapter 6 Basil describes how the martyrs stripped themselves of their clothes as soon as they heard the archon's decision, Μετὰ χαρᾶς ἀπορρίψαντες ἕκαστος καὶ τὸν τελευταῖον χιτῶνα, πρὸς τὸν διὰ τοῦ κρύους ἐχῶρουν θάνατον. In chapter 7 he describes their guard's acceptance of Christianity and his brave decision to join in their martyrdom with the expression, ρίψας τὰ περιβόλαια. The theme is treated by the hymnographer in the second sticheron of the vesper, ῥίπτοντες περιβόλαια πάντα, βαίνοντες ἀτρόμως εἰς λίμνην. . . .<sup>24</sup> The use of the participles ρίψας by Basil and ρίπτοντες by the hymnographer denotes knowledge of Basil's text. Further, in chapter 6 Basil says,

Ἐπειδὴ διὰ τὸν ὄφιν ἐνδυσάμεθα, διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκδυσόμεθα.  
Μὴ ἀντισχώμεθα ἱματίων, διὰ τὸν παράδεισον ὃν ἀπωλέσαμεν.

In the second sticheron of the vesper service John Monachos writes,

πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔλεγον οἱ Ἅγιοι Μάρτυρες· Διὰ Παράδεισον, ὃν ἀπωλέσαμεν, ἱμάτιον φθαρτὸν σήμερον μὴ ἀντισχώμεθα· δι' ὄφιν ποτὲ φθοροποιὸν ἐνδυσάμενοι, ἐκδυσώμεθα νῦν. . . .<sup>25</sup>

Before the archon gave the order that the martyrs be exposed to the cold, he endeavored to entice them away from their faith. Their answer was μισῶ τὴν δωρεὰν ζημίας πρόξενον (chapter 4). John reproduces this

<sup>21</sup> *Menaion*, March 9, p. 33, col. 2.

<sup>22</sup> The hymn has as question mark at this point instead of a colon, most probably a misprint.

<sup>23</sup> The reference to winter here had a double meaning. The hymnographer speaks allegorically, alluding to life on this earth and its pains.

<sup>24</sup> *Menaion*, March 9, p. 33, col. 2.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

scene in his canon, Ode Four, stanza one, with the φρενοβλαβεῖτε ἔλεγον, οἱ Ἀθληταί, τὴν πρόξενον ζημίας, δωρεὰν προτείνοντες.<sup>26</sup> In chapter 3 Basil describes vividly the many tortures the infidel was prepared to inflict upon the martyrs in order to break their morale.

Τὸ πῦρ ἔτομον, τὸ ξίφος ἠκόνητο, ὁ σταυρὸς ἐπεπήγει John responds to this description in Ode Four, stanza two, with the Ἥκονημένα ξίφη καὶ θήρας καὶ πῦρ, σταυρόν τε τοῖς Ἀγίοις, οἱ Χριστοῦ διώκται, ἐπανετήνεντο.<sup>27</sup> Basil continues in chapter 4 with the martyrs' answer to the archon's enticement,

Φιλότιμός εἰμι πρὸς τὴν ἄνω τιμὴν, κόλασιν δέδοικα, τὴν ἐν τῇ γεέννῃ. Πῦρ ἔχειν μοι φοβερόν, τὸ δὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπειλούμενον ὁμόδουλόν ἐστιν.

John gives a similar description in the canon, Ode Four, stanza three with the

Φοβερόν ἡμῖν ἔλεγον, οἱ Ἀθληταί, τὸ πῦρ τὸ τῆς γεέννης· τὸ δὲ νῦν, ὡς σύνδουλόν, οὐ πτοοῦμεθα.<sup>28</sup>

Similarly, Basil's ἐκείνων ἐστὶ ἡ φωνή· Διήλθομεν διὰ πυρὸς καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἐξήγαγες ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀναψυχὴν<sup>29</sup> is used by the composer of the *kathisma*, who is probably none other than John, in the following form: ἔργοις ἐκπληρώσατε τοῦ Προφήτου τὰ ρήματα· διὰ πυρὸς γὰρ καὶ ὕδατος, γενναίως διήλθετε, ἀναψυχὴν εὐράμενοι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.<sup>30</sup>

The martyrs' major concern, Basil states, was their fear that one of them might lose his courage in the face of torture and renounce Christ, a fear that was momentarily realized when one of them did renounce Christ and was ushered quickly to the nearby hotbath to recover from the exposure to the cold.<sup>31</sup> Basil in chapter 8 likens the incident to the last minute betrayal of Judas. But just as Matthias

<sup>26</sup>*Menaion*, March 9, p. 35, col. 2.

<sup>27</sup>*Menaion*, March 9, p. 35, col. 2. John's reproduction flows better than Basil's text, which switches from the plural personal to the singular with the *μω* and creates some awkwardness.

<sup>28</sup>*Menaion*, March 9, p. 35, col. 2.

<sup>29</sup>Chapter 8, Basil's quote is from Ps. 66, 12.

<sup>30</sup>*Menaion*, March 9, p. 35, col. 2.

<sup>31</sup>Μία ἦν εὐχή. Τεσσαράκοντα εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸ στάδιον, οἱ τεσσαράκοντα στεφανωθείμεν, Δέσποτα. Μὴ λείψῃ τῷ ἀριθμῷ μηδὲ εἷς.

was called upon to replace Judas, so now the martyrs' guard confessed his faith in Christ and joined their martyrdom, ἀπῆλθεν Ἰούδας καὶ ἀντιστήχθη Ματθίας. John picks up the theme in Ode Six, stanza two.

Γεγηθώς ὁ ἀρχέκακος ἤρπασεν, ὡς τῆς δωδεκάδος Ἰούδαν τὸν δειλαιον. . . .<sup>32</sup> The conduct of the guard made the archon extremely angry, and John adds, 'Αναιδής ὢν εἰκαίως φρυάττεται' οἷα γὰρ Ληστῇ καὶ Ματθίᾳ τὸ πρότερον, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ὁ τύραννος, τοῦ φρουροῦντος τῇ κλήσει σπαράττεται. Basil notes that the renegade did not avoid death because the contrast from the cold to the hot eventually killed him (chapter 7).

Ἐλεεινὸν θέαμα τοῖς δικαίοις, ὁ στρατιώτης φυγὰς . . . καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐλεεινότερον ὅτι καὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς διήμαρτε καὶ οὐδὲ ταύτης ἀπέλαυσεν, εὐθύς αὐτῷ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν τῇ προσβολῇ τῆς θερμῆς διαλυθείσες.

The canon points to the incident with the Ματαίοφρων καὶ θρήνων ἐπάξιος, ὅς τις τῶν ζωῶν ἀμφοτέρων διήμαρτε· διὰ πυρὸς γὰρ λέλυται, καὶ πρὸς πῦρ ἐξεδήμησεν ἄσβεστον, Ode Six, stanza three.<sup>33</sup> Although the canonist had to use words that would best fit his meter, the presence of διήμαρτε and διὰ πυρὸς γὰρ λέλυται instead of Basil's τῆς σαρκὸς γὰρ ἐν τῇ προσβολῇ τῆς θερμῆς διαλυθείσης leads us to believe that the canonist follows the meaning of the language of Basil fairly closely.

Elsewhere Basil mentions that one of the soldiers was not quite dead when the bodies of the other martyrs were picked up, placed on a carriage, and carried to the fire. The executioner deliberately left the half-dead soldier behind in the hope that he might renounce at the last minute. Dreading this possibility, the mother of the soldier picked her son up, αὕτη ταῖς οἰκείαις χερσὶν ἀραμένη, and placed him on the carriage along with the dead bodies of the martyrs, urging him to follow the good road lest he delay his appearance before his Lord (chapter 8).

Ἀπῆθι, φησὶν, ὦ παῖ, τὴν ἀγαθὴν πορείαν, μετὰ τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν, . . . μὴ ἀπολειφθῆς τῆς χορείας, μὴ δεύτερος ἐμφανισθῆς τῷ Δεσπότη.

<sup>32</sup>*Menaion*, March 9, p. 36, col. 1.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*

The subject is treated in Ode Eight, stanzas three and four,

Ῥωμαλεότητι φρενῶν, ὃν ἐκύησεν ἐπ' ὤμων ἀραμένη, 3  
οὐ φέρω σε δεύτερον, τῷ ἀγνωσθέντι Θεῷ ἐμφανισθῆναι, 4

In Basil the mother took her son in her own hands, whereas in the canon she put him on her shoulder. Similarly, in Basil the mother is afraid that her son might appear before the Lord after the thirty nine; that is the meaning of δεύτερος. The same concern preoccupies her in the canon, with the exception that whereas Basil uses δεύτερος and the verb in the subjunctive, John uses δεύτερος and the infinitive of the same verb to render the mother's concern.<sup>34</sup>

Our discussion of the encomiastic speeches of Basil leads us to the following conclusions. First, Cappadocia holds a distinct position in the praise of the early martyrs of the Church. The persons giving this praise are the Cappadocian Fathers, especially Basil and Gregory the Theologian, both of whom commemorated the martyrs by encomia to their martyrdom. The texts of their discourse constitute a source of inspiration for the Byzantine hymnographers who were so familiar with their writings that they often followed their language closely. Secondly, the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers became a remarkable source of Byzantine hagiology since they provided indispensable information about the life and especially the martyrdom of these martyrs. In some of the instances, their collection of the information for eye-witnesses and second hand sources may have saved for us information which might not otherwise have survived the accidents of history. Whether all their descriptions are historically accurate may be debatable, but that the kernel of their account is cannot be doubted. Furthermore, the discourses of the early Fathers are surely important as carrying over to the Christian world the genre of panegyric speeches which had started with the ancient Greeks.

<sup>34</sup>The scene of the mother's concern reminds us of the Maccabees' story in the Bible, which Gregory the Theologian emphasizes in his *Discourse on the Maccabees* making the mother an example to all mothers exactly as Basil does in chapter 8.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Saints Basil and John Chrysostom on the Education of Christian Children

---

BERNARD SCHLAGER

WITH THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE IN 312 A.D. THE CHRISTIAN Church had at last won not only official recognition and a pledge of tolerance from the Roman government but an indispensable ally in the emperor himself. However, although Christians had triumphed after nearly three centuries of persecution, Constantine's conversion and sponsorship of the Church did not erase tensions the Christian minority felt between the values of the world and the demands of their faith. In matters of morality, religion, and philosophy, the pagan majority's views, diverse as they were, presented fourth-century Christians with a formidable yet familiar challenge: how to benefit from the rich legacy of Graeco-Roman culture while remaining faithful to the Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

The education of children was one important arena within which Eastern Christians of the fourth century grappled to absorb critically elements of pagan culture and two works from this century offer an intriguing point of entry to the topic. Saint Basil's *Address to Young Men on the Right Use of Greek Literature* is concerned with young Christians who have received a classical education, the form of which had remained essentially unchanged since the last creative stage of

<sup>1</sup>On the vitality of the pagan cults under the first Christian emperors see M.L.W. Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca, 1951), p. 5. See A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D." in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano, (Oxford, 1963), p. 81, for a discussion of Christianity's rapid expansion throughout the Empire in the fourth century.



its development in fourth century B. C. Greece.<sup>2</sup> It is significant that the Christian Church in the classical era never developed an alternative to the pagan schools;<sup>3</sup> nor did Christians retreat from the academies of grammar and rhetoric that spanned the Empire in the ancient world. To the contrary, they continued to patronize these schools which offered the only means for Christians to receive a general education and prepare for upper level careers in politics or the military.<sup>4</sup>

*On Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children* by John Chrysostom provides the best condensation of this saint's thoughts on education;<sup>5</sup> more specifically, it speaks about the duty of parents to provide, within the context of the Christian home, a proper upbringing for their children. Well aware that Christians would not, *en masse*, join the desert ascetics in their retreat from corrupt city life, Saint John recommends ways in which parents can raise wise and virtuous children within a morally lax urban environment.

An examination and comparison of these two works reveals a new spirit of confidence among Eastern Christians in their approach to education. Neither Basil nor Chrysostom, as we shall see, were blind to the dangers of Greek literature and contemporary pagan culture for Christian students; however, they did not advocate a renunciation

<sup>2</sup>See H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York, 1964), p. 137.

<sup>3</sup>William Barclay, *Train Up a Child: Educational Ideals in the Ancient World* (Philadelphia, 1960), p. 238, posits three reasons why the early church did not provide a general education for its children: the belief in the imminent return of Jesus, the poverty of the church, and the illegality of the religion throughout the Empire. By the fourth century, however, these reasons were no longer valid and, with the conversion of Constantine, the Church would have been free to develop its own educational system except, of course, during the brief reign of Julian the Apostate (301-03 AD); nonetheless, Christians produced no such system to rival or replace the pagan institutions, as the Jewish people had in the form of their synagogue schools (see Marrou, p. 422). One exception to this was the development of the monastic schools in the fourth century, but these schools were intended primarily for the training of prospective monks and not for the laity. See M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971), p. 120, on fourth century monastic education.

<sup>4</sup>As Marrou, p. 378, points out, the Greek term ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία (referring to education in math, science, language and literature which served as a preparation for the study of philosophy) was rendered in Latin by the term *artes liberales*. On humanistic education as a preparation for employment in the civil service, see Glanville Downey, *Antioch in the Age of Theodosius the Great* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1962), pp. 58-59.

<sup>5</sup>Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* 3 (Utrecht, 1966), p. 465.

of pagan education for the followers of Christ. Rather, both Basil and Chrysostom set forth concrete proposals which took advantage of the treasures of Christian scripture and tradition without negating the benefits to be gained by an acceptance of certain elements of classical civilization in the education of youth.

*Address to Young Men on the Right Use of Greek Literature*<sup>6</sup>

There has been some amount of discussion in recent years concerning the date of Basil's address.<sup>7</sup> For the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to note that the work was written by Basil in his later years as he himself states early in the address:

For the fact that I have reached this age, and have already been trained through many experiences, and indeed also have shared sufficiently in the all-teaching vicissitude of both good and evil fortune, has made me conversant with human affairs, so that I can indicate the safest road, as it were, to those who are just entering upon life.<sup>8</sup>

Basil provides a poignant description of his relationship as mentor to his young audience: he says that he cares for them with the same affection as that of their own parents and hopes to remain a source of guidance for them until his death. The address was intended primarily for the saint's own nephews (and perhaps his nieces), but Basil also speaks to their parents and he may well have expected that his words of advice would be published and made available to a wider audience.<sup>9</sup> It is clear from the text that the Bishop's young relations

<sup>6</sup>Saint Basil, *To Young Men, On How They Might Derive Profit From Pagan Literature*, trans. R. J. Deferrari and M.R.P. McGuire, in *Saint Basil—The Letters*, vol. 4, Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 378-435. (Hereafter Basil.)

<sup>7</sup>Ann Moffatt, "The Occasion of Saint Basil's *Address to Young Men*," *Antichthon* 6 (1972) 83, dates the work between June 17, 362 (when emperor Julian the Apostate promulgated his short-lived edict banning Christian teachers from the schools) and June 26, 363 (the date of Julian's death); N. G. Wilson, *Saint Basil on the Value of Greek Literature* (London, 1975), p. 9, and Erich Lamberz "Zum Verständnis von Basileois 'Ad adolescentes'," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 90 (1979) 221-41, disagree that the address was written in immediate response to Julian's edict and hence accept the traditional dating of the address to the mid—to late—370s.

<sup>8</sup>Basil, p. 379.

<sup>9</sup>See Wilson, pp. 7-8, on the makeup of Basil's audience and on the probability that publication of this address was intended. Deno Geanakoplos, "St. Basil, 'Christian Humanist' of the 'Three Hierarchs' and Patron Saint of Greek Letters," *The Greek*

had received at least some training in grammar and they may have already begun their studies in rhetoric.<sup>10</sup> Taking advantage of the students' familiarity with Greek literature, Basil says that he confidently expects that they will heed his worthwhile advice and be like that type of person whom Hesiod praised for following the course as already marked by others.<sup>11</sup> The saint emphasizes, however, that his young listeners ought not to relinquish responsibility for their education to either the teachers in the schools<sup>12</sup> or the ancient pagan authors lest they become like ships without rudders, following wherever they are led; no, the Christian student ought to distinguish prudently between the valuable and valueless in heathen literature and Basil promises to show his students how to make this important distinction.<sup>13</sup>

The son of a rhetorician, Basil (born 329) was raised in an affluent, landowning Christian family in Asia Minor, and received a traditional education in grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy. He studied in Constantinople and in Athens (where he may have been a pupil of the famous rhetorician Libanios)<sup>14</sup> and then taught rhetoric himself in Athens for a short period of time before being baptized circa 358. Shortly after his reception into the church Basil abandoned the prospects of a civilian career to join his family in their pursuit of an ascetical life in rural Caesarea. Ordained in 365, Basil combined an active priestly ministry with his ascetical life; in 370 he was elevated to the archbishop of Caesarea and remained active as bishop there until his death in 379.

---

*Orthodox Theological Review* 25 (1980) 98, believes that Basil is addressing young men preparing for the priesthood, and Sherman Garnett, "The Christian Young and the Secular World: St. Basil's Letter on Pagan Literatures," *ibid.* 26 (1981) 212, calls attention to the address's "double audience" of adults and children.

<sup>10</sup>See Lamberz, 80, on the educational background of Basil's nephews, and Clarke, p. 11, on the basic stages of classical education.

<sup>11</sup>Hesiod, *Works and Days*, pp. 293-97, trans. by H. N. Fowler, quoted in DeFerrari and McGuire, p. 379: "That man is altogether best who considers all things himself and marks what will be better afterwards and at the end; and he, again, is good who listens to a good adviser; but whoever neither thinks for himself nor keeps in mind what another tells him, he is an unprofitable man."

<sup>12</sup>This is an interesting comment on the part of Basil since there were many Christian teachers of grammar and rhetoric in the schools by the middle of the fourth century. See Clarke, p. 119, and Marrou, p. 430.

<sup>13</sup>Basil, p. 381.

<sup>14</sup>Downey, p. 89, concludes that Libanios and Basil, if not teacher and student, respectively, were at least friends.

Basil's classical training is evident in this address through his numerous references to Greek mythology, literature, and philosophy. There are interesting parallels between Basil's address and Plutarch's essay "How to Listen to Poetry" and it may well be that Basil had read this pagan work which recommends the study of poetry as a preparation for the study of philosophy.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, there is clear evidence of Basil's familiarity with the thought of Plato and the Neoplatonists in the address as well an acquaintance with the later philosophical traditions of Stoicism and Cynicism.<sup>16</sup>

Central to Basil's discussion of the value of pagan literature for young Christian students is his belief that a study of such literature can admirably serve as a useful propaedeutic to the study of Scripture, which, the saint says, points the way to eternal life.<sup>17</sup> Since the present immaturity of his young relatives, however, prevents them from comprehending the mysteries revealed by Scripture, Basil recommends that they first look at the pagan poets, prose writers, and orators to see what profit can be gleaned from them for the care of their souls.<sup>18</sup> In typical fashion the author employs colorful imagery to illustrate his point: as soldiers gain valuable practical experience by engaging in sport, so too does the student prepare "the eye of the soul" to approach the mysteries of scriptural teaching by studying pagan writings; similarly, as cloth undergoes a series of preparations prior to being dyed a particular color, so too is the student prepared for scripture study by a previous acquaintance with heathen literature.<sup>19</sup> Turning to the scriptures, Basil points to two biblical figures whom he says learned from pagan lore before advancing to

<sup>15</sup>See Plutarch, *How to Study Poetry*, 37, in *Moralia* 1, Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, MA, 1927), pp. 195-97.

<sup>16</sup>Michel Casevitz, "Basile, le Grec et les Grecs: Réflexions linguistiques," *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (Amsterdam, 1981) 318, traces numerous references in Basil's address to the Platonic dialogues. Although the view of George Büttner, *Basileios des Grossen Mahnworte an die Jugend über den nützlichen Gebrauch der heidnischen Literatur*, (Munich, 1908), who believed that Basil used a Cynic-Stoic diatribe as a model for his own address, has been discounted today (see Lamberz, 84), there are indications of Cynic influence in the address, as Wilson, p. 9, points out. Geanakoplos, p. 98, calls attention to Neoplatonic influences in the address and Laistner, p. 62, argues that Basil had read Plotinos' *Enneads* and possessed a rather sophisticated knowledge of New Platonism.

<sup>17</sup>Basil. p. 383.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid. p. 385.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid. pp. 383-85.

the study of religious truth: Moses first studied Egyptian thought before contemplating the one true God, and Daniel, while captive in Babylon, learned from the pagan Chaldeans before devoting himself to the sacred Jewish teachings.<sup>20</sup> The saint summarizes his view on the value of well-chosen pagan literature for Christian students in these words:

Although we Christians shall doubtless learn all these things more thoroughly in our own literature, yet for the present, at least, let us trace out a kind of rough sketch, as it were, of what virtue is according to the teachings of pagans.<sup>21</sup>

The criterion for choosing suitable stories from Greek literature is an ethical standard for Basil: when pagan writers retell deeds of the gods and men which are good, the student should listen; however, when authors recount evil deeds, the student should stop his ears much like Odysseus did upon hearing the sirens' call.<sup>22</sup> The reason for refusing to listen is clear: "For familiarity with evil words is, as it were, a road leading to evil deeds."<sup>23</sup> As examples of poetry unfitting for the Christian student, Basil lists the following: when the poets represent characters reprehensible to Christians (such as drunkards or gluttons) or when they speak of the gods as many instead of one they should be ignored. As for the adulterous deeds of the pagan gods, and especially those told of Zeus, such unspeakable behavior should be left to the theater.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, when the pagan authors laud virtue and condemn vice, Basil urges his students to pay close attention.

As examples of good pagan literary models Basil singles out Hesiod's description of the long, arduous path of virtue as appropriate for the student's consideration as well as the poetry of Homer, the entirety of which the saint describes as an exhortation of virtue.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup>Ibid. p. 387.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid. pp. 429-431.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid. p. 389.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid. pp. 393-95. Basil's favorable estimation of Homer reflects the high esteem in which the poet was held by pagan culture. See Marrou, pp. 29-30, on the role of

Indeed, Basil believes that the best pagan literature is concerned, in some way or another, with a discussion of virtue and he concludes that "almost all the writers who have some reputation for wisdom have, to a greater or less degree, each to the best of his power, discoursed in their works in praise of virtue."<sup>26</sup> The saint offers two delightful metaphors to illustrate the necessity of a selective use of Greek literature by Christians students: as bees choose only some flowers from which to draw nectar, so too should the student selectively take from pagan literature what is good and conforms with the truth. Similarly, in plucking the roses from profane literature the student must take care to avoid the flowers' harmful thorns.<sup>27</sup> The ability to distinguish between the beneficial and harmful elements in such literature is of the utmost importance for the student since the character of his soul is at issue. Basil writes:

We ought not to take everything without exception, but only such matter as is useful. For it is disgraceful to reject foods that are harmful, yet for the teachings which nourish our souls to have no concern, but to charge onward like a mountain torrent, carrying along everything it chances upon.<sup>28</sup>

Basil presents five examples of deeds recounted in pagan literature which can be understood by his students not only as preparations for the understanding of Christian precepts but as reflections of Christian truths themselves. The first three deal with pagan responses to violence: Pericles was tormented all day long by an enemy and yet treated his enemy kindly at day's end by escorting him home through the dark of night; Euclid of Megara responded to a man who had threatened him with death by pledging to placate and overcome the anger of this enemy. Both of these instances, Basil concludes, are examples which can be called to mind by a student in a fit of anger since both point to scriptural decrees that one should submit to one's persecutors and bless, rather than curse, one's enemies.<sup>29</sup>

---

Homer's poetry in classical education.

<sup>26</sup>Basil, p. 399.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid. pp. 391-93.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid. p. 407.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid. pp. 401-05. See Matthew 5.39: "But I say to you, Do not resist one who is

The third example is Socrates, who passively submitted his face to the blows of a drunken attacker and sought his revenge by simply writing the name of the assailant on his swollen forehead for all to see. Basil draws a parallel between Socrates' actions and the Christian precept to turn the other cheek.<sup>30</sup> Another admirable deed from pagan literature is found in Alexander's refusal to so much as look at the beautiful daughters of Darius because he considered it shameful for a conqueror of men to be so conquered by women. In a similar vein Basil points to a correlation between the pagan Alexander's actions and the Gospel admonition against lusting after a woman in one's heart.<sup>31</sup> Lastly, the saint mentions Cleinias, a follower of Pythagoras, who refused to take an oath in order to avoid a fine; Saint Basil concludes that Cleinias must have heard of the scriptural command against taking oaths.<sup>32</sup>

Throughout the address Basil refers to the goal of eternal life as the ultimate end of the Christian life;<sup>33</sup> pagan literature is of value, therefore, only insofar as it helps the Christian on his journey to this everlasting reward. The goal of heaven, however, is in sharp contrast to the insignificant finite aspirations of pagans: profane literature promises that the rewards of a virtuous life are realized in an old age but Basil urges his students to compare the legendary ages attained by Tithonus, Argahonius and even Methuselah with the unending life which awaits the Christian. In order to win the incomparable heavenly prize Basil urges his young listeners to lead virtuous lives.<sup>34</sup>

---

evil . . ." and Matthew 5.44: "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you." (Revised Standard Version [RSV]).

<sup>30</sup>Basil, pp. 403-05. See Matthew 5.39: "But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also . . ." (RSV)

<sup>31</sup>See Matthew 5.28: "But I say that every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart." (RSV)

<sup>32</sup>See Matthew 5. 34-37: "But I say to you, Do not swear at all . . ." (RSV). See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, Volume 1 in *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, (Chicago, 1971), p. 33, on the belief of many Church Fathers, following in the tradition of the Jewish apologists, that the ancients had met Hebrew Testament figures or read from this Testament and derived certain truths from these biblical individuals or writings. In Basil's interesting example of Cleinias, a contemporary of Plato, we read that the pagan had heard of a Christian precept long before the time of Christ.

<sup>33</sup>On the Christian goal of eternal life see Basil, pp. 381-83, and pp. 431-33.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.* p. 433.

*On Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents  
to Bring Up Their Children*<sup>35</sup>

As indicated by its title, this homily treats of two related subjects: a relatively short discussion of vainglory introduces the main topic of raising children. Chrysostom identifies a variety of ills inflicting church and society with the scourge of vainglory: vainglory is responsible for discord within the church and its influence can be seen in the morally harmful diversions of the theater and circus as well as in the showgiver's senseless pursuit of popular acclaim.<sup>36</sup> The preacher vividly characterizes vainglory as, among other things, a harlot, beautiful and tempting to the young man as she stands outside her brothel; once lured into her trap, however, the youth sees the ghastly spirit for what she really is.<sup>37</sup> As a cure for the evils wrought by vainglory Chrysostom proposes his regimen of education, the goal of which is the inculcation of the Christian virtues of wisdom, temperance, and fear of the Lord:

Let us then implant in him [the child] this wisdom and let us exercise him therein, that he may know the meaning of human desires, wealth, reputation, power, and may disdain these and strive after the highest. And let us bring words of exhortation to his mind: "My child, fear God alone and fear none other but Him."<sup>38</sup>

Following in the steps of their ancestors in the faith, fourth-century Christians considered the family an indispensable element in the education of children. Not content to leave the moral and religious guidance of its young members to the care of slaves, tutors, or even philosophers, the Church placed its primary trust in parents to provide the initial religious and moral formation for children within the context of the home.<sup>39</sup> John Chrysostom shares this view on the role of the

<sup>35</sup>Saint John Chrysostom, *An Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children*, trans. M. L. W. Laistner, in Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca, 1951), pp.85-122. (Hereafter Chrysostom.)

<sup>36</sup>Chrysostom, pp. 85-94.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. pp. 86-87.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid. p. 121.

<sup>39</sup>Generally speaking, the Greeks used slaves and tutors in the moral formation of children while the Romans placed a particular emphasis on the role of the family



family in the training of children and he ardently promotes it throughout the homily. In speaking of the role of parents in the education of their children, Chrysostom focuses primarily on fathers as the teachers of their sons. Nevertheless, he does include several significant references to the role of the mother in the education of both son and daughter and, at the end of the homily, he urges mothers to train their daughters with the same precepts he has outlined for fathers and sons.<sup>40</sup> Both parents have been charged, the eloquent preacher says, with the solemn duty of raising "athletes for Christ";<sup>41</sup> they are sculptors charged to "remove what is superfluous and add what is lacking"<sup>42</sup> in their child's character.

Chrysostom appreciates the fact that his young listeners will pursue secular careers and specifically mentions that he is not calling for all boys to enter the monastic life.<sup>43</sup> To prepare their sons for secular careers Chrysostom recommends that parents praise such careers and draw to their sons' notice honors attainable in political and military life: boys destined for a political career should be taught to pay attention to virtuous political affairs whereas boys marked for military service should learn how to avoid "base gain" and defend the wronged.<sup>44</sup> In a variety of ways, therefore, parents serve as the most important teachers of their children and the raising of good Christians necessitates the involvement of parents from early childhood on in order to ensure that a firm foundation is laid for virtuous living.

Chrysostom laments the lack of concern shown by parents for their own children's moral training at that point early in the homily when he shifts from the discussion of vainglory to his exposition on education:

What will become of boys when from earliest youth they are

---

(and the mother in particular). The Christian stress on the responsibility of parents and the entire family in raising children imitated that of the Jews who viewed the family as bearing the primary responsibility for the child's moral and religious education. See Marrou, pp. 313 and 419. For a discussion of the family's role in Jewish and Christian education see Lewis J. Sherrill, *The Rise of Christian Education* (New York, 1944), pp. 47-52 and pp. 157-59.

<sup>40</sup>See Chrysostom, pp. 100, 103-04, 122.

<sup>41</sup>Chrysostom, p. 95.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid. p. 96.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid. p. 95.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. pp. 120-22.

without teachers? If grown men, after being nurtured from the womb and continuing their education to old age, still do not live righteously, what wrong will not children, accustomed from the threshold of life to empty words, commit? In our own day every man takes the greatest pains to train his boy in the arts and in literature and speech. But to exercise this child's soul in virtue, to that no man any longer pays heed.<sup>45</sup>

It is significant that Chrysostom does not criticize, in the above passage, the care that parents take to provide their children with a classical education. As a matter of fact, at no place in this homily does the preacher condemn pagan education as such; to the contrary, he assumes that the children in his congregation will attend the schools<sup>46</sup> and he never tries to dissuade their parents from patronizing these institutions of learning. This is not surprising, of course, since Chrysostom himself was the product of a classical education and, like Basil, had been preparing for a secular career before his conversion to Christianity. More importantly, however, the saint's acceptance of classical education demonstrates the fact that he maintained an open attitude toward classical culture after his baptism and did not reject the totality of Graeco-Roman culture simply because it was pagan.<sup>47</sup>

Born in 349, Chrysostom was raised in the faith by his mother (his father, a successful official in the imperial civil service in Antioch, died when the saint was a young boy) and studied literature, rhetoric (under Lebanios, as Basil may have done), and philosophy. After a dramatic conversion, which resulted in his decision to formally join the church, Chrysostom discontinued his studies and was baptized in 368. Retreating to the desert, he lived for several years as a hermit outside of Antioch and returned, in broken health brought on by his rigorous practices of self-mortification, to the city in the mid-'70s. In 381 he was ordained a deacon and, in 386, a priest. Chrysostom remained in Antioch, winning renown for his dynamic

<sup>45</sup>Ibid. pp. 94-95.

<sup>46</sup>See, for example, Chrysostom, p. 102, where the preacher mentions that biblical stories be told to the boy when he is taking a break from his studies.

<sup>47</sup>For a seminal article disputing the once commonly-held view of Chrysostom as fiercely anti-Hellenic, see A. Naegele, "Johannes Chrysostomos und sein Verhältnis zum Hellenismus," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 13 (1904) 73-113.

preaching, and was consecrated bishop of Constantinople in 398; there he ministered for several years until, having run afoul of both church and government enemies, he was forced into exile in 404. Chrysostom lived in Armenia for three years and died en route to Pityus in 407.

It is not possible to assign a specific date for this homily. Although Haidacher concluded that it was written during Chrysostom's Antiochene period (386-98), based on a comparison of similar references to church turmoil in this homily and in Chrysostom's Homilies 10 and 11 on Saint Paul's Letter to the Ephesians (which Haidacher believed were composed at Antioch), Laistner argues convincingly that attempts to arrive at a date based on such comparative analyses are problematic.<sup>48</sup> Following Laistner's argument, therefore, we are left with a broad range of years during which the homily was composed: from Chrysostom's priestly ordination at Antioch in 386 to his episcopal tenure in Constantinople which ended in 404.

Although we would be mistaken to read the homily as a treatise on the pagan school, Chrysostom does reveal in this work his feelings, both positive and negative, on a few aspects of pagan education. For instance, he accepts a role for slaves as guardians for young people, provided they are carefully selected to ensure their suitability for the task,<sup>49</sup> but he discourages, in contrast to traditional Graeco-Roman pedagogical practice, the frequent use of corporal punishment in the training of children.<sup>50</sup> A search for obvious influences of pagan thought in this homily is frustrated by the fact that the preacher does not cite any classical authorities nor does he include any references from pagan literature.<sup>51</sup> Chrysostom does make use of the Platonic theory of the tripartite soul in his remarks on the

<sup>48</sup>See Laistner, pp. 78-84 for a discussion on the date of Chrysostom's homily. For a contemporary view in support of Haidacher's theory, see Joseph Glagla, trans. and ed., *Johannes Chrysostomos Über Hoffart und Kindererziehung*, (Paderborn, 1968), pp. 58-60.

<sup>49</sup>See Chrysostom, pp. 100-02. The concern shown by Chrysostom for the moral character of those slaves involved in education, however, pales in comparison to the saint's emphasis on the parental role in the education of children.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid. pp. 99-100. On the frequent use of corporal punishment for training children in ancient societies see Barbara Kaye Greenleaf, *Children Through The Ages: A History of Childhood* (New York, 1978), pp. 22-23. Marrou, pp. 220-22 and 366, and Laistner, n. 21, p. 137, conclude that the ancient Greeks made frequent use of corporal punishment in education. Michael Gärtner, *Die Familienerziehung in der alten Kirche* (Köln, 1985), p. 451, on the other hand, views ancient Greek pedagogical practice as generally sparing in the use of corporal punishment.

<sup>51</sup>Gärtner, p. 451, places this homily solidly within the tradition of ancient

building of good character in children, but his failure to specifically credit the philosopher undoubtedly reflects the fact that this concept was a familiar one for his audience.<sup>52</sup> The pagan school is not discussed in this homily, beyond brief mention, because Chrysostom believes that its value pales in comparison with the more significant elements of the family home and the church community in the raising of honorable Christian children.

In addition to his emphasis on the role of parents in the education of children, Chrysostom stresses the importance of Scripture for the inculcation of moral lessons in the young: through the telling of Bible stories parents educate their children and provide them with an indispensable foundation in the faith. A look at some of Chrysostom's recommended methods for parental storytelling as well as his suggestions concerning which stories are particularly suited for children reveals an appreciation for the abilities of children, at different and stages of their intellectual development, to grasp various moral lessons from biblical literature.

The first story recommended by Chrysostom is that of Cain and Abel and the preacher suggests that at first only the most essential elements of the story be told to the child by his parents. During these initial tellings of the story Chrysostom advises that the names of the characters not be introduced and that parents tell the tale by means of a clear and easily understood vocabulary. Gradually, over the course of several retellings, the names of the biblical characters should be introduced and more elements of the story added. No untruths, however, are permitted to embellish the story — only what adheres to the scriptural account is permissible. Chrysostom suggests that the story of Cain and Abel be repeated often by the mother and father so that the child will come to learn it by heart; after the child has memorized the tale, the parents should ask him to retell it and then explain to him its various meanings. When the child is brought to church the parents are urged to pay particular attention when the story of Cain and Abel is proclaimed in the Liturgy: with glee will

---

pedagogical treatises, claiming the unmistakable influence of Aristotle and Pseudo-Plutarch's *The Education of Children*. Laistner, pp. 77-78, argues persuasively that there is no solid evidence supporting the view that Chrysostom necessarily consulted other writings on education, including the Pseudo-Plutarch treatise.

<sup>52</sup>For an overview of the use of Plato in both Greek and Latin patristic literature see Frantisek Novotny, *The Posthumous Life of Plato* (Prague, 1977), pp. 177-218.

the youngster recognize and anticipate the story, Chrysostom says, and the tale will become further fixed in the child's memory.<sup>53</sup>

Chrysostom's reason for recommending scripture stories as the best literature for Christian children is obvious: such stories are excellent vehicles for teaching Christian values. The preacher states that the Cain and Abel story, for instance, teaches the nature of God's punishment and the resurrection of the dead. Unlike pagan stories which, according to the saint, speak confusedly of the souls of good persons being transformed into those of heroes, the raising of the dead (taught by the reception of Abel into heaven) is clearly understood by the child and causes him to marvel.<sup>54</sup>

Simple stories are best for young children, Chrysostom stresses; as the child grows, however, so does his ability to comprehend more complex stories. In his metaphor comparing the child's soul to a newly founded city, the preacher advises parents, the builders of this city, to consider the age and maturity of their children when choosing stories: "When we are still engaged in ordering the gates, we need the more artless stories; when we have entered in and are training the citizens, then is the time for those of a loftier kind."<sup>55</sup> Once the story of Cain and Abel has been learned by the child a second story, evidently more sophisticated than the first, is to be introduced: Chrysostom recommends that of Jacob and Esau. Once again, the names of these biblical figures are not to be mentioned so that the youngster might concentrate on the essential meanings of the story. This story provides more pleasure for the child, Chrysostom asserts, due to the reversal of fortune and the older age of the story's characters and it presents many lessons: respect for one's father and, reflecting an interesting interpretation, the danger of the greed of the belly since Esau's hunger lured him to abandon his birthright.<sup>56</sup> As the child matures, Chrysostom recommends that "more fearful tales" be introduced, those previously unsuitable for a younger child, such as stories about hell, the flood, Sodom's destruction and tales from the New Testament.<sup>57</sup> The final recommended stories are those

<sup>53</sup>Chrysostom, pp. 102-06.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid. p. 104.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid. p. 114.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid. pp. 105-06.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. n. 109

of the patriarch Joseph and the kingdom of heaven.<sup>58</sup> With the increasing age and maturity of the child, therefore, Chrysostom believed that more complex stories were suitable for teaching an array of moral lessons to Christian children.

Although the emphasis in this homily is on the use of Scripture in the moral formation of children, Chrysostom does not rule out the use of pagan heroes in his program of moral education. The saint makes the following remark near the end of the homily:

Let us guide the conversation [of the child] to the kingdom of heaven and to those men of old, pagan or Christian, who were illustrious for their self-restraint. Let us constantly flood his ears with talk of them.<sup>59</sup>

This reference clearly permits the inclusion of suitable pagan characters, and presumably pagan literature in general, in the stories told to children by their parents. As we have seen, Chrysostom has not condemned pagan education nor has he advised against the enrollment of Christian young people in the schools; he undoubtedly realized that Christian students would be exposed to pagan literature within these schools. Nevertheless, for Chrysostom pride of place is clearly reserved for biblical literature in the training of children.

H.I. Marrou has written that a culture's educational ideals and practices provide a valuable key to understanding the culture as a whole.<sup>60</sup> This insight holds true with regard to the Eastern church of the fourth century; in fact, questions concerning the education of children can be fruitfully viewed, as we have said, within the larger context of the interaction between the faith and Hellenism in a century crucial to the development of Christian doctrine.<sup>61</sup> Both of the works considered above exemplify the manner in which Eastern Christians critically absorbed elements from their predominantly pagan culture as they endeavored to develop a distinctively Christian culture.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid. p. 111.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid. p. 118.

<sup>60</sup>Marrou, p. 228: "A school is a microcosm in which the macrocosm of culture is reflected."

<sup>61</sup>For discussions on the impact of Hellenistic thought on Christianity in general and on the long-standing debate over the "hellenization" of Christianity see Aloys Grillmeier, "Hellenisierung—Judaisierung des Christentums als Deutepinzipien der Geschichte des kirchlichen Dogmas," *Scholastik* 33 (1958) 321-55 and 528-58; and Pelikan, pp. 45-55.

Furthermore, we see in both works a recognition that, although profane literature could be of use to the Christian student, the Bible is the infinitely greater literature for Christians since it alone contains the consummate revelation of truth. Saint Basil builds upon the classical foundations established in his young hearers; at the same time, however, he harbored no doubts that Sacred Scripture far surpassed the literature of the ancients. Saint John Chrysostom recommends biblical stories as both the foundation and edifice of such training although he doesn't outlaw the inclusion of pagan literature in his program of moral education.

Basil permitted the use of pagan literature in a Christian's education so long as such literature was in accord with the faith. The saint subscribed to the view that what one reads affects the development of one's character and, therefore, good profane literature could fittingly serve as a propaedeutic for the study of biblical literature since both convey worthwhile moral lessons to the student. The value of the former literature, however, rests on its preparatory nature: once the student has acquired, with the help of an experienced mentor, the maturity and wisdom necessary to understand Scripture, the need for pagan literature falls away.<sup>62</sup>

Chrysostom presents us with a somewhat different approach to literature and Christian education. Although he accepted appropriate stories from pagan literature for the mature student, the saint undoubtedly believed that biblical literature should form the underpinnings of a child's moral education. It is important, moreover, to keep in mind that Chrysostom does not condemn here the classical education that children receive, an education that relied exclusively on pagan classics for its texts.

Basil and Chrysostom, therefore, agree that the Bible is the literature *par excellence* for Christian young people and such an emphasis by classically trained men demonstrates the fact that an important stage has been reached in the development of Christian culture. The followers of Christ had grown more confident in the literary value of their own sacred writings and were able to accept appropriate pagan literature in the education of their children without

<sup>62</sup>As Garnett remarks, pp. 223, "The transformation of the reader stands at the heart of Basil's project. The poetry of antiquity is limited in its usefulness; it can be used to channel the passions, but once a young man has obtained self-control, it is better to forget poetry all together. Poetry is not effective as an aid in moral education without the guardianship of a wise teacher."

undue fear that they would be morally corrupted by the pagan authors. As Basil makes clear, the writers of the pagan past could be useful for Christian students who possessed, in the literature of sacred scripture, an authoritative ethical measure for evaluating the pagan writers. Those writings which conformed to the holy standard could be safely studied.

Another point of comparison between these two works relates to the role of the teacher in education and both works reflect a typically Christian emphasis on the parent in the moral training of youth. As we have seen, Basil compares himself to his nephew's own parents and expects that he and his listeners share this view of the important role of parents in the formation of children. The pagan school teacher, as well as the authority of the profane writers, therefore, has a far less important role in comparison to the parent-like role of mentor which Basil assumes.

Chrysostom's homily highlights the crucial task of parents in the moral formation of their children and thus reveals more explicitly than Basil's address this Christian emphasis on the place of parents in education. As Gärtner emphasizes, Chrysostom's homily reveals another essential feature of Christian education in the ancient world: the complete Christianization of family life.<sup>63</sup> A life of simplicity and strict discipline, Scripture reading, the singing of religious hymns, and the cultivation of virtuous speech are all elements in this comprehensive involvement of the family in the formation of Christian children which Chrysostom promotes.<sup>64</sup> With confidence placed in the home (as the first and most important classroom) and parents (as the best and most influential teachers for their children), Christians realized that they had little to fear from the pagan authors, teachers, or schools. This is because, as parents, they provided a firm and lasting moral foundation which would be nurtured throughout life (and beyond the school years) within the larger family of the church under the guidance of the bishop and his ministers.<sup>65</sup> Through the offices of preaching, sacramental administration and spiritual guidance these ministers carried out, in Christ's own name, the

<sup>63</sup>Gärtner, p. 452.

<sup>64</sup>See Chrysostom, pp. 92-93, 102-111, and 188 for some of his references to the variety of ways that a child is to be trained by the family.

<sup>65</sup>See Sherrill, pp. 180-81, on the teaching role of bishops and other ministers in the early church.



instruction in the faith begun in the home.

Basil's address, lost to the West until it reappeared during the Renaissance when it proved a valuable authority in condoning the study of classical literature,<sup>66</sup> had a continuous and profound influence in the East. Indeed, Geanakoplos writes that this essay "provided, for the entire Orthodox world, the ecclesiastical sanction necessary for study of the classics."<sup>67</sup> Unlike the West, where the classical system of education did not survive the sunset of the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire effectively maintained the classical system of education<sup>68</sup> and Basil's address undoubtedly influenced the views of generations of Eastern Christians on the subject.

Chrysostom's homily was apparently not as influential as Basil's address perhaps because it offered no revolutionary insights in its discussion of the roles of Christian parents and the Bible in the moral formation of children.<sup>69</sup> Nevertheless, his homily provides us with a distinctively Christian pedagogy that, although not specifically concerned with the question of the pagan schools and literature, does not reject pagan literature or a classical education for Christian children who have been provided with the necessary moral foundation.

In both of these works we recognize, therefore, attempts by Eastern Christians of the fourth century to define more discriminatingly their relationship to pagan culture than had their fellow believers in previous centuries; perhaps most significantly, they devised ways to incorporate valuable elements of pagan literature into a program of education that respected the precedence of the Bible in Christian life. They largely succeeded in their attempts and this century reflects an important stage in the development of a Christian pedagogy; it also marks the birth of a truly Christian civilization.<sup>70</sup> As Downey writes in reference to the humanistic culture developing under the

<sup>66</sup>The essay was translated by Leonardo Bruni at the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. See Wilson, p. 14.

<sup>67</sup>Geanakoplos, p. 100.

<sup>68</sup>See Marrou, pp. 131-32.

<sup>69</sup>A typical estimation of the importance of Chrysostom's homily in the history of education at large is that of James Bowen, *A History of Western Education* (New York, 1972), 1 p. 289, who compliments Chrysostom on his insights into human nature and yet concludes, rather severely, that the saint's homily "represents much of the poverty of Christian education thought of the times and its lack of an affirmative doctrine to encompass all of man's life."

<sup>70</sup>See Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA, 1965), n. 74.

reign of Theodosios the Great (379-95), "Christians could now recognize that true faith could be both strong enough and wide enough to admit the intellectual heritage of ancient Greece in its best aspects, and transform it for Christian use."<sup>71</sup> In so doing, Christians were providing an adequate answer to the question Tertullian had asked in the previous century: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem; the Academy with the Church?"<sup>72</sup> The city of philosophers offered a sophisticated intellectual tradition of incomparable value for the continuing development of theology in the city of faith and the Greek academy provided a program of humanistic learning and a body of literature which Christians could confidently, albeit selectively, employ in the education of their children.

<sup>71</sup>Downey, *Antioch in the Age of Theodosius the Great*, p. 55.

<sup>72</sup>Tertullian, *De praescriptione* 7.9, in *Corpus Christianorum Series latina* (Turnhout, 1953-).

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

of Constantine the Great at the Council of Arles in 314 and at other Councils ("Konstantin d. Gr. und das Reichskonzil von Arles, 314," pp. 151-174). Hans Christof Brennecke ("Erwägungen zu den Anfängen des Neunizänismus," pp. 241-257) writes that the origins of the so-called "new-niceanism" are not rooted merely in Church politics, as has been argued, but within a particular theological context.

These are only a few examples of the rich and varied content of this Festschrift. The book also contains a bibliography of Professor Schneemelcher's writings and a preface by His Holiness Patriarch Dimitrios.

— Joost van Rossum



CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS, *Saints Raphael, Nicholas and Irene of Lesvos*. Modern Orthodox Saints 10. Belmont, Massachusetts: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1990. Pp. xviii, 200. Frontispiece + 25 illustrations. Cloth \$10.95. Paperbound \$7.95.

Dr Constantine Cavarinos, President of the Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, inaugurated the Modern Orthodox Saints series in 1971. In the two decades since, nine volumes have appeared on St Cosmas Aitolos, St Macarios of Corinth, St Nicodemos the Hagiorite, St Nikephoros of Chios, St Seraphim of Sarov, St Arsenios of Paros, St Nectarios of Aegina, St Savvas the New, St Methodia of Kimolos, and now a tenth volume on Saints Raphael, Nicholas and Irene of Lesvos. When one considers the span of time and the range of subject matter, this is a truly remarkable achievement and a major contribution in English to Orthodox Christian hagiography. The appearance of the tenth volume is an appropriate occasion on which to congratulate the publisher-editor-author Constantine Cavarinos for his dedication and selflessness to a most worthy cause and to a project that is unique in its high significance and longterm value.

The tenth volume in the *Modern Orthodox Saints* series is dedicated to three newly revealed saints who suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Ottoman Turks in 1463 at the Monastery of Nativity of the Theotokos near the village of Thermi on the island of Lesvos, ten years after the fall of the Byzantine imperial

capital to the Turks. Dr Cavarinos explains that he has included these chronologically earlier saints in his series at this time because they were unknown until 1959. Cavarinos himself visited the site of Karyes in 1961 where the martyrdom took place. He interviewed the principal persons who claimed to have seen the saints in dreams and visions, spent time in Karyes and Thermi, and gathered much material. This was supplemented by material from the book *A Great Sign (Sēmeion Mega)* by the noted hagiographer and writer Photios Kontoglou (first published in 1962), and others.

The current book is organized in a fashion similar to the others in the series. Dr Cavarinos provides an Introductory that is followed by translations of hymnographer Gerasimos Miragrananitis's "Life of Saints Raphael, Nicholas, and Irene"; "Miraculous Cures (1959-1961)" by Photios Kontoglou; "Miraculous Cures (1959-1967)" by Iakovos Kleomvrotos, Metropolitan of Mytilene; "Miraculous Cures (1969-1984)" as narrated by persons who became well or by their relatives; "Spiritual Counsels of St Raphael"; "Lessons We Learn from the Saints of Thermi by Constantine Cavarinos; and "Reflections on the Appearances of the Saints" by Photios Kontoglou, followed by the usual notes, bibliography, and index. There is also a Preface, reproduction of the Apolytikia, Kontakion, and Megalynarion of these saints, with quotations from other saints (and others) on the value of reading hagiography.

A great deal of the book is dedicated to the dreams, visions, and healing of the saints of people who experienced their presence and benefaction and to the discovery and excavation of the site of their martyrdom. Cavarinos himself believes that we can draw certain conclusions from these revelations, including the understanding that "there is such a thing as *psyche* or *soul*—an entity distinct from the body, an enduring center of consciousness, of thinking, of feeling, of choosing or willing, of distinguishing between truth and falsehood, good and evil, the beautiful and the ugly—an entity, often spoken of as "the inner man, which survives the death of the body, is immortal" (p. 156); that the God of believers is a God of the living, not of the dead; that the newly martyred saints provide powerful argument for the immortality of the soul; that the manifestations of the saints confirm the dogma of the Holy Trinity and the teaching of the intercession of saints; and that the martyrs of Thermi confirm and stress that "the relics of saints are channels of Divine grace, and hence should be looked upon and treated with great reverence" (p. 161). In connection with the last, Dr Cavarinos cites St Symeon the New Theologian and Nicholas Cavasilas and the Orthodox doctrine of *theōsis* or

the divinization of man through Divine grace. Additionally, Cavarnos sees confirmation of the Orthodox doctrine and practice of making icons that depict holy individuals, and the importance of the Cross in the life of the saints as a symbol of the greatness of martyrdom. Cavarnos states that "through martyrdom, the martyr becomes a recipient of the Divine grace, is purified of all taint of sin and is sanctified, receiving heavenly glory and honor. Also, through martyrdom, faith is revitalized in people" (p. 166). The author also points out the practice of honoring saints by means of hymns, and he sees confirmation of the traditional Orthodox view that monasticism is a vital Christian institution and that the appearances of the Martyrs of Thermi reaffirm the teaching of the Orthodox Church that miraculous cures are effected by the saints during their lifetime and after their death. The counsels of the newly martyred saints also stress the importance of the virtues of faith, obedience to God, humility, patience, spiritual love and forgiveness and the practices of repentance, fasting, confession, Holy Communion, the reading of religious books, and prayer.

The date designated by the Church for the celebration of the memory of Saints Raphael, Nicholas, and Irene of Lesvos is the first Tuesday after Pascha. Dr Cavarnos has now made it possible for a much wider audience to learn about these saints and the lessons that can be learned from them by Orthodox Christians everywhere.

— *John E. Rexine*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## The Account from Old Harbor: Regarding the Baptism of Kodiak Alutiiq (1794-1795)

---

S. A. MOUSALIMAS

WE SPENT TWO DAYS AT UNALASKA AND BAPTIZED MORE THAN one hundred people . . . then we baptized more than six thousand people through the winter on Kodiak, who were so willingly baptized that they destroyed and burnt all their shamanistic array.<sup>1</sup>

Focusing upon the more definite aspect in the quotation, the number of baptized that the source would have ascertained from the records he was keeping, a reader is met with an extraordinary number; and if he assumes the number to be representative of whole lineages or an entire population, he is met with an impelling question: Why

<sup>1</sup>Archimandrite Ioasaph [Bolotov] to Nazarii hegoumenos of Valaam, 19 May 1795, transcript, cat. no. 643:50, Holy Ruling Synod, Russian Reproductions (Golder collection), Library of Congress Manuscript Division [henceforth: HRS/RR/LCM]. The number is given also in: Report, Ioasaph to Archbishop, 19 May 1795, no. 643:41 HRS/RR/LCM, where it is specified as indicating virtually the entire population. The number is conveyed by Veniamin bishop of Irkutsk [and Nerchinsk] to Archbishop, 22 Nov. 1795, no. 643:33 HRS/RR/LCM; and by Gavriil Metropolitan of Novgorod [and St. Petersburg] to Platon Zubov, 18 Feb. 1796, no. 643:30 HRS/RR/LCM. The rounded number of "slightly less than 7,000" is given in: Letter, Monastic Herman to Nazarii hegumen of Valaam, 19 May 1795, no. 643:54 HRS/RR/LCM.

For the original mss. of HRS/RR/LCM, see: "ms. cat. no. 643, *Arkhiv Sviatieishago Pravitel'stviuushchago Sinoda, Archiv Gosudarstvennago Sovieta* [Central State Historical Archive USSR, Leningrad]," as cited by Frank A. Golder, *Guide to Materials for American History in Russian Archives*, Carnegie Institution Publications, no. 239 (Washington, D.C., 1917), p. 9; also cited by LCM, catalog listing for "Russian Reproductions," p. 3.



should such numbers be baptized? — indeed, baptized within nine months of the missionaries' arrival, as the statement was dated in May 1795, and the missionaries had arrived at Kodiak in September 1794.

As the missionaries could not be expected to have achieved this number themselves during the nine months, reasons would be sought within processes preceding or immediately contemporaneous with the missionaries' arrival in the Kodiak area, and a reason has been found in the village of Old Harbor as recounted by a *toyuk* of longstanding: a leader with traditional roles and of particular stature, Simeon Haakanson.<sup>2</sup>

The account from Old Harbor relates to Kodiak Island and also to the Alutiiq regions of the Alaska Peninsula where the sequence of events was fundamentally the same, and where three leaders, all originally from the village of Belkovsky, were cited by name by Haakanson. They also had received the same account and had communicated it; they also were leading tradition bearers of particular stature, and of particular abilities, themselves.<sup>3</sup>

Old Harbor is the village nearest the site of an initial settlement founded by force, tantamount to a paramilitary invasion, by the "American Northeastern, Northern and Kurile Company," tied ultimately to interests at Petersburg.<sup>4</sup> Thus founded in 1784, the initial settlement was subsequently relocated to *Pavlovskaiia gavan*

<sup>2</sup>Personal communication, Simeon Haakanson (Sven Sr.), Old Harbor, Kodiak, 26 April 1988, recounted with his permission. Among other official and local governmental titles, he had been the "Council President" for ten years (or eleven?) until spring 1987, and had become the vice president by April 1988 to nurture the development of younger leadership.

My own previous and subsequent experiences at Kodiak and elsewhere in Alaska were never pursued for research; therefore, they will not be cited as fieldwork. Nor will the personal relationships I entered into be used for the purposes of quotation except in this instance with expressed permission. These relationships, nevertheless, create the foundation for the perceptions that have combined to allow me to see, indeed to see repeatedly, that the spirituality is profound, and the religion is deeply rooted.

<sup>3</sup>Their names are contained in my notes. The derivation and the indication of their social status should be sufficient.

<sup>4</sup>For a detailed chronology, see Lydia T. Black, "The Russian Conquest of Kodiak," *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska*, special issue (in print). For the euphemisms that draped the bloodshed, and for the euphemisms' effect upon subsequent ecclesiastical history, see S.A. Mousalimas, "Grigorii Ivanovich Shelikhov (Kodiak, Alaska): In his own Words, the First Missionary," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* (in print).

(today's Kodiak town); and it was to the latter location that the missionaries arrived in 1794.

### *The Account*

According to the account from Old Harbor, the Alutiiq people continued to resist the invaders, and were selective in their contacts. Yet when the missionaries arrived, the Alutiiq people welcomed *them*, and willingly received baptism, because the Alutiiqs' own leading "shamans" had had visions and had given advice. Whole villages accepted baptism with receptive leaders; and while a few dissenting shamans went to live apart, village membership coalesced around baptism.

### *An Analysis*

Each element in the account — (a) the Alutiiqs' continued resistance; (b) their reception of the missionaries; (c) the exile of the few dissenting shamans; and (d) the receptivity by leading visionaries — is consistent with the historical sources and furthermore substantiated by parallel events elsewhere in Alaska.

### *Continued resistance*

While the invaders of Kodiak pretended otherwise in public statements,<sup>5</sup> the Alutiiq were never actually conquered. To the contrary, the Kodiak Alutiiq had been "pacified" in terms of resistance by direct warfare only. Otherwise they remained actively defiant and continued to resist, indeed they counted fatalities among the invaders. According to a retrospective statement by a Kodiak eyewitness to the initial events of '84, yet long afterwards "we did them harm"; and he provided a specific instance as follows: "The lake contained sea hedgehogs (sea urchins), which are poisonous. We knew of this but smartly kept it to ourselves. We never ate them; not even gulls touched them. Many Russians died upon eating them. But in other ways, too,

<sup>5</sup>E.g., Grigorii I. Shelikhov *A Voyage to America, 1783-1786* [*Rossiiskago kuptsa Grigoriia Shelekhova* [sic] *stranstvovanie v 1785 godu* (Petersburg, 1791; 2nd ed. 1792; 3rd ed. 1793)], trans. Marina Ramsay, Limestone Press Alaska History Series ed. Richard A. Pierce [henceforth: LPAH] (Kingston, Ont., 1981), pp. 42-5. This account was originally submitted as a report to the governor-general at Irkutsk, dated 19 April 1787. It was published as a book in 1791, and then published in many editions from 1792 to 1894 (four editions in the year 1793 alone). For the publication data, see Richard A. Pierce, ed., Bibliography: Editions, in *ibid.* pp. 146-47.

we did them harm.”<sup>6</sup>

The same message is contained, understated, in the account, from Old Harbor, and the message is corroborated by information in letters written from the 1790s into the 1800s by the onsite company manager who reported the danger from Kodiak Alutiiq and other Native Alaskans<sup>7</sup> — a danger that reached the proportion of a possible large scale revolt.<sup>8</sup>

Continued resistance is evident in another manner through the 1830s, when a source, Fr. Ivan Veniaminov, asserted too hastily yet very significantly that the Kodiak Alutiiq refused to be submissive to “Church duties”: “All who have been to Kodiak unanimously agree that the Aleuts there [the Alutiiqs] almost never go to church. Secretly and openly, they adhere to their own shamanism; and very few fulfill their duties with regard to the Church, usually only those living in the main settlement.”<sup>9</sup>

“All who have been to Kodiak unanimously agree [*edinoglasno govoriat*]”: the source was conveying an opinion which had been expressed by certain others, but the assertion of “unanimity” is mitigated by different sources.

<sup>6</sup>“The Account of the Kodiak Elder Arsenii Aminak” in Heinrich Johan Holmberg, “Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des Russischen Amerika,” *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, vol. 4, part 1 (Helsinki, 1856), p. 415; see *ibid.*, in *Holmberg's Ethnographic Sketches*, Rasmuson Library Historical Translation Series, vol. 1, trans. Fritz Jaensch, ed. Marvin W. Falk (Fairbanks, 1985), pp. 58-59.

<sup>7</sup>Letter, Aleksandr Baranov to Shelikhov and Polevoi, 20 May 1795; Letter, Baranov to Malakhov, 11 June 1800; Letter, Baranov to Larionov, 22 March 1801; in P. A. Tikhmenev, ed., *A History of the Russian-American Company*, vol. 2: *Documents [Istoricheskoe obozrenie obrazovaniia Rossiisko-Amerikanskoi kompanii i deistvie eia do nastoiashchago vremeni]*, vol. 3: *Prilozhenie* (Petersburg, 1863)] trans. Dmitri Krenov, eds. Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly, LPAH (Kingston, Ont., 1979), pp. 68, 105, 126-27. Also see uprisings in the Kenai and Chugach regions in Letter, Aleksandr Baranov to Shelikhov and Polevoi, 20 May 1795; Letter Baranov to Polomoshnoi, 28 April 1798; Letter, Baranov to Radionov, 14 May 1800; Letter, Baranov to Larionov, 24 July 1800; in Tikhmenev, ed., *Documents*, pp. 76, 92, [103], 107, 115.

<sup>8</sup>Letters, Baranov to Larionov, 24 July 1800, and 22 March 1801, in Tikhmenev, ed., *Documents*, 115, 126-27.

<sup>9</sup>Ivan Veniaminov, “Sostoianie Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v Rossiiskoi Ameriki,” *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniia* vol. 26, no. 5 (1840), p. 39. Also see the following translation from a later edition: *id.*, “The Condition of the Orthodox Church in Russian America: Innokentii [Ivan] Veniaminov's History of the Russian Church in Alaska” [“Sostoianie. . .,” ed. Ivan Barsukov, *Tvoreniia Innokentiiia*, vol. 2 (Moscow: 1887), pp. 1-42], trans. and eds. Robert Nichols and Robert Croskey, *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 2 (1972), p. 49.

These different and mitigating sources, themselves contemporary with or prior to the assertion, state that "Aleuts" (otherwise undifferentiated and thus signifying, or including, Kodiak Alutiiqs) would gather on Sundays and feastdays at a distance from the company settlement, *Pavlovskaiia gavan*: they were worshiping at *Elovoi Island* (today's Spruce Island) with the last surviving missionary.<sup>10</sup>

He was the monastic Herman (a dialectical rendering of the name *Germanos*) who had acted alongside Alutiiq leaders against the on-site company management at the turn of the century,<sup>11</sup> and had since removed himself from *Pavlovskaiia gavan* to isolated forested *Elovoi* (sometime after 1807 and before 1819) where he resumed the anchoritic life that he had known in the forests of Karelia at the Monastery of Valaam.<sup>12</sup> From this forest hermitage at *Elovoi*, he extended his mission to the colonial administration:<sup>13</sup> a direction inverse to the more usual thrust of missionary work.

<sup>10</sup>Letter, Sem'en Ianovskii to Damascene hegumen of Valaam, 22 Nov. 1865, in Valaam Monastery, *The Russian Orthodox Religious Mission in America, 1794-1834* [*Ocherk iz Istorii Amerikanskoi Pravoslavnoi Dukhovnoi Missii: Kad'iakskoi Missii 1794-1837 gg.* (Petersburg, 1894)], trans. Colin A. Bearne, LPAH (Kingston, Ont., 1798), p. 82. Also see Letter, Ianovskii to Damascene, 3 Sept. 1866, in *ibid.* p. 93. About the source: naval officer Ianovskii was the acting chief manager of the Russian-American Company from 1818 to 1820, knew the monastic Herman personally, and wrote in retrospect about him to Damascene the hegumen of Valaam.

<sup>11</sup>Baranov, letter to Larionov, 24 July 1800, in Tikhmenev, ed., *Documents*, p. 121; Hieromonk Gideon, Secret report from Kodiak to Metropolitan Amvrosii, 2 June 1805, critical ed. and trans. Lydia T. Black in *The Round the World Voyage of Hieromonk Gideon, 1803-1809*, Alaska State Library Historical Monograph 9 and LPAH (Kingston, Ont., and Fairbanks, 1989), p. 77; Ianovskii, letter to Damascene, 22 Nov. 1865, in Valaam, *Mission*, p. 82.

<sup>12</sup>It is important to note that this anchorite was living within a tradition in which he had been well steeped, and he was recognized by the Monastery of Valaam as being securely within this tradition. After numerous years of monastic life, he was sent to Kodiak by Nazarii, the hegumen of Valaam. Herman then corresponded by letter with the subsequent abbot of Valaam, Ioafan. After Herman's repose (+ 1836), a further hegumen, Damascene, recognized his achievements, and collected information about him in the 1860s. When the collection was published in 1894 (in Valaam, *Istorii . . . Missii* [see note 10, above]), the Monastery of Valaam described Herman as a "Holy Elder" (see *ibid.*, *Mission*, p. 33, also see pp. 28-40). The same year as this publication, Valaam also published his *vita*: *Zhizn Valaamskago Monakha Germana, Amerikanskago Missionera* (Petersburg, 1894). It is important to note these facts to differentiate him clearly from merely anyone who might don monastic garb and chose to live in a forest.

<sup>13</sup>Ianovskii to Damascene, 22 Nov. 1865, in Valaam, *Mission*, pp. 84-85. Also see, Notebook, Konstantin Larionov, "Information about Father Herman," 7 Sept. 1866, in *ibid.*, p. 104. About the sources: for Ianovskii, see note 10 (above). Konstantin

Some "Aleuts" and "Creoles" (Alutiiqs and Russian-Alutiiqs) had settled at *Elovoi* to live in proximity to him;<sup>14</sup> and they would then be joined by others on Sundays and feastdays. This activity on the small island was reflected in the designation assigned to the location officially in 1831: "New Valaam,"<sup>15</sup> named for the Monastery of Valaam in Karelia from where the missionary himself had derived.

The evidence from "New Valaam" into the 1830s thus mitigates Veniaminov's hasty yet very significant assertion published in 1840. Instead of remiss in "their duties to the Church," the Kodiak Alutiiq were selective.<sup>16</sup>

Why would Veniaminov have written the assertion? The question merits attention within the text of this paper, because the credibility of the source needs to be ascertained. Veniaminov had been the priest of the neighboring parishes of Unalaska and Sitka, the church of each parish separated from Kodiak by many hundreds of miles; and he most probably, indeed quite certainly, had never been in the Kodiak area prior to publication.<sup>17</sup> No record of a visit to the Kodiak area

---

Larionov, Russian-Aleut himself, had known the monastic Herman during Larionov's own childhood in the Kodiak area in the 1820s and particularly the 1830s. As an adult, while holding the position of *starosta* (warden) of the Kodiak church, Larionov wrote about him in retrospect. Larionov also collected accounts from Alutiiq and Russian-Alutiiq older people who had also known Herman.

<sup>14</sup>Letter, Herman to Ianovskii, 20 June 1820; Narrative of the Pilgrim Lazarev, [dated by inscription] October 1864; Notebook, Larionov, 7 Sept. 1866: in Valaam, *Mission*, pp. 76, 91, 107. About the sources: for Ianovskii and Larionov, see notes 10 and 13 (above). The pilgrim Lazarev made a pilgrimage to *Elovoi* where he collected reminiscences from people who still lived there about Herman who had reposed in 1836.

<sup>15</sup>Communication of the Chief Manager, F.P. Vrangell [Wrangell], 18 June 1831, no. 345, cited by Richard A. Pierce, Notes in Valaam, *Mission*, p. 178. But the name had been attached to this place earlier: see Letter, Herman to Ioafan hegumen of Valaam, 13 Dec. 1819, in Valaam, *Mission*, p. 115; also see Letter, Ianovskii to Damascene, 22 Nov. 1865, in *ibid.*, pp. 81-82.

<sup>16</sup>The assertion is further mitigated by evidence which derives twenty-eight years subsequent to Veniaminov's report. On Afognak Island, away from the (now former) company settlement, Alutiiq and Russian-Alutiiq villagers were constructing a new church building for themselves through their own labor and with their own resources, to replace their prior building that had become too small for their needs. See Eli Lundy Huggins, *Kodiak and Afognak Life 1867-1870*, LPAH (Kingston, Ont., 1981), pp. 28-29.

<sup>17</sup>That same year, Veniaminov's comprehensive notes were published as book, and they also contain the assertion about Kodiak: Ivan Veniaminov, *Zapiski ob ostrovakh Unalashkinskogo otdela 2* (Petersburg: 1840), p. 147. See *ibid.*, Notes on the Islands

is contained in Veniaminov's journals from the date of his initial arrival in Russian-America until the eve of his initial departure: from October 1823 into the year 1837.<sup>18</sup> He departed for Petersburg in November 1838 from *Novo Arkhangel'sk* (Sitka) southward around Cape Horn; and he returned in 1840, the same year as the publication. Only then, after the publication, did he visit the Kodiak area: specifically in the year 1842, for eighteen days, as the bishop of a newly created diocese of Kamchatka, the Kuriles, and the Aleutians (a visit that was brief yet meaningful).<sup>19</sup>

Thus without immediate experience in the Kodiak area prior to the publication, Veniaminov had relied on information for the assertion from "all who had been to Kodiak," as he himself admitted forthrightly.<sup>20</sup> They were unanimous in their opinion. He was conveying their opinion.

In contrast, he had personal insights, and exercised discernment, within the Unalaska region where he had extensive experience,<sup>21</sup> so that he remains a key source in many respects there, particularly with respect to pastoral care, linguistics, and aspects of ethnography. His credibility there can not be extended to the Kodiak area, however. For example, he had taken the initiative to meet an elder who was referred to as a "shaman" by the local populace in the Unalaska region, and discovered that this baptized man differed from normal shamans.

---

*of the Unalashka District*, trans. Lydia Black and R. H. Geoghegan LPAH (Kingston, Ont.: 1984), p. 231: "Of the Kad'iak people only about a hundredth part fulfill the obligations of Religion [*obiazannosti Religii*] to any extent and very few of them may be acknowledged as diligent in it."

<sup>18</sup>Ivan Veniaminov, *Journals: the Unalaska and Sitka Years, 1823-1837*, Rasmuson Library Historical Translation Series, University of Alaska, Fairbanks (in print).

<sup>19</sup>For an incident described by Veniaminov for that visit in 1842, see Archbishop Innokentij [Ivan Veniaminov] to Damascene hegumen of Valaam, in Valaam, *Mission*, p. 101. Although brief the visit was meaningful and was remembered: see Hugins, *Kodiak and Afognak Life*, p. 29. For a summary chronology of Veniaminov's movements, see Richard A. Pierce, *Russian-America: A Biographical Dictionary*, LPAH (Kingston, Ont. and Fairbanks, AK: 1990), p. 524. I am assuming that the vessel *Okhotsk*, transporting Veniaminov from the town of Okhotsk to Novo Arkhangel'sk between 19 August and 26 September 1841, did not stop at Kodiak on the way; but if it happened to harbor there briefly, the fact would remain that he had not been to Kodiak prior to 1840, and subsequent to that date he visited only briefly.

<sup>20</sup>Veniaminov, "Sostoianie," in *Zhurnal* (1840), p. 39.

<sup>21</sup>See Veniaminov, *Zapiski* 2, pp. 1-327; *Notes*, pp. 157-323.

Having met him, and having gained personal insights, Veniaminov differentiated the content of this particular man's experiences.<sup>22</sup> Veniaminov had entered into no such personal relationships in the Kodiak area however, and he exercised no such immediate insights prior to the publication.

Yet his assertion about Kodiak is very relevant nonetheless, as it indicates that the Kodiak Alutiiq were refusing to submit to the "duties [*obiazannosti*]" required of them. "Usually only those in the main settlement" were complying.<sup>23</sup> In other words, a few in the company's main settlement who were thus probably conformed to the foreign occupation and to the imperial designs, were conformed visibly to such "duties."<sup>24</sup>

But otherwise, non-conformity was observed by "all who had been to Kodiak." It was noticeable enough to elicit the "unanimous" opinion, and disconcerting enough to be reported. Instead of conformity to the occupying authority, there was resistance.

### *The Reception of a Missionary*

An otherwise resistant people welcomed the missionaries, and received baptism.

Two missionaries had traveled to Kodiak area villages within the initial nine months in 1794/95, each singly with an interpret-

<sup>22</sup>Letter, Ivan Veniaminov to Archbishop of Irkutsk, June 1828, "true copy of the original, Tobol'sk, 5 Nov. 1829," transcript in Miscellaneous Papers, Russian Church, Alaska Historical Library Archives, trans. Lydia T. Black in "Ivan Pan'kov: an Architect of Aleut Literacy," *Arctic Anthropology*, vol. 14, no. 1 (1977), pp. 100-02. See this letter in Ivan Barsukov, ed., *Innokentii Metropolit Moskovskii i Kolomenskii, Pis'ma* (Petersburg, 1897-1901).

The modern literary treatment of this instance of Veniaminov's ministry may merit as much attention as the event in 1828 itself, to ascertain some underlying notions within the Western or Westernized mental construct. For example, in a version of an article about the event published in *Sourozh: a Journal of Orthodox Life and Thought*, no. 30 (Nov. 1987), pp. 10-17, the editor added an unauthorized *précis* in which the baptized Aleut elder became an "Alaskan Indian," and Veniaminov became an ecumenist of sorts who had entered into a dialogue with a non-Christian. When the idea prevails (albeit intrinsically) that Christianity is European, and when the idea itself seems unusual that a European leader would seek spiritual conversation with an "Indian," then Veniaminov's meeting with this man in 1828 would appear more commendable, and the discernment of the spiritual gifts would appear more extraordinary. But Ivan Veniaminov was the pastor of an Aleut parish, and moreover he was himself Eurasian.

<sup>23</sup>Veniaminov, "Sostoianie" in *Zhurnal* (1840), p. 39.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

er;<sup>25</sup> and both returned alive, although either missionary could easily have met with an "accident," as there are coastal villages, joined not by land routes over the interior mountains which are glaciated, but by sea routes navigated by baidarka and baidara (kayak and open skin-boat), along which fatal accidents by drowning occurred. Yet both returned, indeed well enough to be enthusiastic about journeys to locations farther afield the next season,<sup>26</sup> and each commenced on his subsequent journey singly again: the one to the eastern Aleutian Islands,<sup>27</sup> the other to the southwest mainland.<sup>28</sup>

The account from Old Harbor about the missionaries' reception is corroborated by similar occurrences elsewhere in Alaska. On the eastern Aleutian Islands, the missionaries were received when they were compelled by inclement weather to harbor while on their way to Kodiak in 1794, as mentioned in the opening quotation (above), and recounted with some detail by the monastic Herman: "during our journey through the Aleutian Islands, we were driven against our will into one bay by unfavorable winds, and the Aleuts there caused us great amazement by their kindness to us in distress and their willingness to be baptized."<sup>29</sup>

Receptivity and readiness were likewise reported by the missionary Iakov Netsvetov, a Russian-Aleut himself, among the Yupiit and Athapascans of the Kuskokwim and lower Yukon River regions in the 1840s and '50s when whole lineages, or kinship based populations, sought him and invited him for baptism.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup>Archimandrite Ioasaph to Archbishop, 19 May 1795, 643:39-40 HRS/RR/LCM; Monastic Herman to Nazarii hegumen of Valaam, 19 May 1795, 643:55 HRS/RR/LCM.

<sup>26</sup>See Herman to Nazarii, 19 May 1795, 643:56-57 HRS/RR/LCM.

<sup>27</sup>For Makarii who joined Unalaska Aleut leaders against the company, see Report, Hieromonk Makarii to Holy Synod, 5 Oct. 1797, received 20 Dec. 1797 (no. 3056), 643:13-23 HRS/RR/LCM.

<sup>28</sup>For Juvenalii who was subsequently killed on the southwest Alaskan mainland, see Michael Oleksa, "The Death of Hieromonk Juvenaly," in *Russia in North America: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Russian America*, ed. Richard A. Pierce, LPAH (Kingston, Ont. and Fairbanks, AK: 1990), pp. 340-341, cf. pp. 336-337. Also see Lydia T. Black, "The Daily Journal of Rev. Father Juvenaly," *Ethnohistory* vol. 28, no. 1 (1981), pp. 33-58.

<sup>29</sup>Herman to Nazarii, 19 May 1795, in Michael Oleksa, ed., *Alaskan Missionary Spirituality* (New York, 1987), p. 40. See 643: 54 HRS/RR/LCM.

<sup>30</sup>Iakov Netsvetov, *The Journals of Iakov Netsvetov: The Yukon Years, 1845-1863*, trans. Lydia T. Black, LPAH (Kingston, Ont.: 1984) p. 47-50, 250-253 [esp. 25 and 30 May 1851], 349-350.



*Exile of Dissenters*

While the reception by the Alutiiq villages was thus deliberate and selective, a few shamans dissented however, and went to live apart, away from the villages. Whether the dissenters chose to go or whether they were banished, the effect would have been the same: they went into exile.

Exile was a traditional method for the maintenance of social cohesion and identity among the ancestral Alutiiqs in the Kodiak area.<sup>31</sup> With the exile of the dissenting shamans, the villages followed the receptive leaders into baptism, and thus membership and mutual identity within the kinship-based communities, or the villages, would coalesce around baptism and Russian Orthodoxy.

*The Receptivity by Leading Visionaries*

Just as the dissenters were referred to as "shamans" in the account, so were the receptive visionaries. It is possible to refer to the latter as leaders with exceptional prophetic gifts, and thus render a difference in terminology equivalent to the difference in response.

Those who were receptive among the Alutiiq had visions; and visions heralded the conversions of other Alaskan peoples, also. Among the Tlingit in the Juneau area in the 1890s the following took place, precipitating Orthodox baptisms.<sup>32</sup>

A young Indian man had a vision. A venerable old man came to him and advised him to go to Sitka and to be baptized. The young man followed the advice. A few years later he became sick, and on his deathbed he called for the elders of his tribe and told them that the same venerable old man came to see him again and told him to advise the other Indians to be baptized. The young man died, but his message did not die with him. Other Indians started having the same vision and

<sup>31</sup>Kodiak Area Native Association [KANA], Oral History project undertaken by KANA for the Old Harbor Tribal Council History (re: B. I. A. 104(a) Grant no. EO1G14207009; cover letter from KANA to the Juneau Area Office of the B. I. A., dated 29 Sept. 1987), pp. 56-66.

<sup>32</sup>Helen A. Shenitz, "The Legend that Built a Church," *Capital City Weekly* [Juneau, AK] (9 June 1967), pp. 1-2, quoted by Roy Stamey, "The Restoration of the Saint Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church, Juneau, Alaska," *Orthodox Alaska*, vol. 8, no.3 & 4 (December, 1979). p. 74. Shenitz and Stamey were associated with this parish.

the urge to be baptized spread like wildfire.

Although this account from the Juneau area refrained from referring to the prophetic Tlingit young man as a "shaman," another account regarding the baptism of Unalaska Aleuts makes the reference explicitly, and the reference clearly corroborates the Old Harbor account: "It seems proper to remember the predictions of the Shamans. It is probable that they much facilitated the work of the missionaries."<sup>33</sup>

The source was Ivan Veniaminov, who remains credible for the Unalaska Aleuts with whom he had lived for a decade and whose language he spoke. He was himself informed about some aspects of the workings of Unalaska Aleut shamans from an older era: neither did he dismiss them offhandedly, nor did he embrace them naively in his retrospective considerations.<sup>34</sup> And in his actual pastoral practice, he demonstrated an ability (deriving from regional knowledge and from patristic guidelines alike) to discern true prophecy from other phenomena.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, he himself was a Russian-Siberian from the Lake Baikal area, in proximity to the Evenk, or "Tungus," from whose language the very word "shaman" originated.<sup>36</sup> Thus it was with particular knowledge that Veniaminov considered the account entrusted to him by the Unalaska Aleut elders.

He arrived at the following conclusion. Having considered whether

<sup>33</sup>Veniaminov, *Zapiski*, p. 148 footnote, *Notes*, p. 231 footnote.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 123-26; *Notes*, pp. 219-20. But if Veniaminov's ethnographic notes pale, in light of the research in S. M. Shirokogoroff, *Psychomental Complex of the Tungus* (London: 1935), the two sources could be studied as complementary: Shirokogoroff applying psychiatric training and indepth fieldstudy to the context of far northern shamanism, Veniaminov applying patristic (Greek Orthodox theological) discernment within the content of the phenomenon. For the latter see note 35, below.

<sup>35</sup>See S. A. Mousalimas, "Russian Orthodox Missionaries and Southern Alaskan Shamans: Interactions and Analysis," in *Russia in North America*, pp. 314-21; but Veniaminov was a parish priest not a missionary. This is a study of the insights reflected in: Letter, Veniaminov to Archbishop of Irkutsk, June 1828 (see note 22, above).

<sup>36</sup>Shirokogoroff, *Tungus*, p. 268; Mircea Eliade, *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy* (Princeton, 1964), p. 4; id., ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 13 (New York, 1987), p. 202. The term has been adopted by social and cultural anthropologists to indicate a type of ritual specialist universally, without the original regional focus. The term has more recently been diffused into various modern popular contexts without specificity.

this account derived from "the fictions of old men" (in other words, the old Aleuts who had related it to him from their parental and grand-parental generations), or whether the prediction was "truly the words of the shamans," he wrote: "I leave it anyone to judge for himself, but I, for the most part, am on the side of the former because the Aleuts all suddenly and without the slightest compulsion accepted the Christian faith."<sup>37</sup>

He accepted the account entrusted to him — "I, for the most part, am on the side of the former" — because the Aleuts "all suddenly and without the slightest compulsion accepted the Christian faith," as he said.<sup>38</sup>

In the Kodiak area, the final proof may also be found in the acceptance of this faith by the Alutiiq, and moreover in the engrafting of this religion into their own community life and identity.

### *Conclusion*

The account from Old Harbor is thus corroborated throughout by historical sources, including finally the reference to Veniaminov; and Haakanson himself is a leader of longstanding and of particular stature within a community in a significant location.

According to the account from Old Harbor regarding the baptism of the Kodiak Alutiiq, 1794/95, the conversion was an indigenous spiritual and social process involving direction by the Alutiiq people's own spiritually gifted leaders.

Once these processes are highlighted, then the historical interpretations would begin to emphasize the meeting of, and synergy between, spiritually gifted indigenous leaders and spiritually gifted alien leaders. Among the latter was, most notably, the saintly forest-dwelling monastic of Valaam, *monakh Herman*.

These interpretations should also emphasize that the Alutiiq people maintained their own culture, as they continued to exercise their own traditions confidently as evinced (within this paper) by the rather hasty yet very indicative statement written in the 1830s by Veniaminov, published in 1840: "they openly adhere to their own shamanism [*svoikh shamanstv*]."<sup>39</sup> The statement was hasty as he himself had never been to Kodiak to meet these "shamans," as he had taken the initiative to meet the (so-called) "shaman" of Akun on the eastern

<sup>37</sup>Veniaminov, *Zapiski*, p. 124; *Notes*, p. 219.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup>Veniaminov, "Sostoianie" in *Zhurnal* (1840), p. 39.

Aleutian Islands. Yet Veniaminov's statement is very indicative; for evidently traditional leaders were practicing openly among a people who were visibly attached to them.

### *A Challenge in Epilogue*

What was the nature of the "shamanizing [*shamanstv*]" that continued among a people baptized? While the question is impelled by Veniaminov's statement, an answer (and a challenge) begins to emerge in light of the quotation that introduced this paper. According to the report from 1795, people "had so willingly been baptized that they had destroyed and burnt all their shamanistic array [*shamanskie nariadi*]"<sup>40</sup> the term "array [*nariadi*]" is indefinite. It was evidently non-inclusive in this context as signified by the statement written by Veniaminov a generation later: that not everything had been destroyed. Some phenomena had been maintained, and they elicited the "unanimous opinion" among "all who had been to Kodiak" (foreigner observers) that this constituted "shamanism." Hence the quotations yield a two-fold reality: (1) the discarding of a type of "shamanistic array"; but also (2) the continuity of some kind of "shamanizing," or rather phenomena that appeared to foreign observers to constitute "shamanizing."

The challenge, therefore, is to discern between these realities, and thus to achieve a perspective into the nature of the "shamanizing" maintained, and the nature of the "array" discarded, by a people decisively baptized. The "shamanizing" maintained may then be discerned as a practicing by healers, or "visionary healers,"<sup>41</sup> who should be expected to practice indeed, should they not? Other "shamans," or perhaps the same ones, may be discovered as bards equivalent to actors when the actor is capable of the emotional, or "spiritual," transference to become "possessed" of his character, and equally capable of emerging from it soundly.<sup>42</sup> This is a perspective that must itself derive from the deepest strata of ancestral cultures where such phenomena continue to occur; otherwise, superficial opinions might again be repeated.

<sup>40</sup>Iosaph to Nazarii, 19 May 1795, 643:50, HRS/RR/LCM.

<sup>41</sup>For an application of this distinction, see Edith Turner, "From Shamans to Healers: the Survival of an Inupiaq Eskimo Skill," *Anthropologica*, vol. 31, no. 1 (1989), pp. 3-24.

<sup>42</sup>See Skirokogoroff, *Tungus*, pp. 131, 362.

And these phenomena do occur unsevered from antiquity in *differing cultural forms* throughout the Orthodox *ecumene*. They occur as "folk" healing, and they occur as "legend" telling (or the representation of the mythic/heroic through song and poetic rendition). They occur together with traditional dances, festivals, runes of laments, and other vital aspects of deeply rooted cultures.<sup>43</sup> Not everywhere, however, have they been allowed to continue to surface, to continue to be cultivated and transformed.<sup>44</sup> Not everywhere has the discernment that would allow this transformation been forthcoming.

The challenge, for discernment and for perspective, would be impelled by a recognition: that the suppression of these phenomena is ultimately intended by alien ideologies (invaders and their collaborators)<sup>45</sup> to thwart the creative surge that would itself well up from strong roots within the deepest ground of the ancient indigenous cultures. The challenge, thus impelled, would be to exercise these ancestral phenomena openly, to allow them their own strength and vitality, and their own transformation within continuous, unsevered culture processes whose vitality stems from the deepest roots. This is the challenge: for the opening outwards of these ancestral phenomena within their own dynamic contexts for their transformation, instead of their suppression.

<sup>43</sup>For fundamentally the same insight, expressed somewhat differently, see (the Romanian) Mircea Eliade, "Survivals and Camouflages of Myths," in *Symbolism, the Sacred, and the Arts*, ed. Diane Apostolos-Cappadona (New York, 1963), pp. 161-193, pp. 38-39.

<sup>44</sup>For an in-depth study of such a transformation, see Philotheos Faros, *Tò pénthos: óρθόδοξη, λαογραφική, καὶ ψυχολογική θεώρηση* (Athens: 1981). For descriptions of instances of such transformations within Alaska, see Nora Marks Dauenhauer and Richard Dauenhauer, eds. *Haa Tawunaagu Yis, for Healing our Spirit: Tlingit Oratory* (Seattle and London: 1990), pp. 32-36; also see Ann Fienup-Riordan, *Eskimo Essays: Yup'ik Lives and How We see Them* (New Brunswick and London: 1990), pp. 94-122.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## The Development of the Concept of an Ecumenical Council (4th-8th Centuries)

---

ARCHBISHOP PETER L'HUILLIER

IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH INSTITUTIONS, ONE CAN NOTICE A continual interaction between factual and conceptual developments. This remark applies to the notion of an Ecumenical Council. Thus, when Emperor Constantine the Great decided to convene a general council in order to end the controversy about the divinity and eternity of the Word of God, and to unify the yearly date of Easter, no precedent to an initiative of such an amplitude existed. However, it can hardly be considered as a bold innovation since regional councils previously had been held in Africa toward the middle of the third century and more recently an inter-regional council of the West had been convened by Constantine in Arles (341). Thus, the decision to convoke a large council in order to solve the controversy brought about by the views of Arius constituted no more than a further step. It is noteworthy that in the authentic documents issued by the Council, the term “*ὀικουμενική*” is not used. Eusebios of Cesarea is the first to give this appellation to the Council of Nicea.<sup>1</sup> However, one can assume that this author did not have in mind a specific category of synod. Furthermore, in the lengthy process of the reception of the “Nicene Faith,” its supporters seldom resorted to juridical arguments. At most they emphasized that, with respect to membership, the Council of Nicea was greater than the following synods.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, at

<sup>1</sup> *De Vita Const.*, 3, 6, PG 20.1060 B.

<sup>2</sup> T. G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (London, 1944), pp. 239-40.

that stage of historical development, approval by the Roman See was not perceived as a decisive factor.<sup>3</sup> The vagueness of the concept of an ecumenical council is well illustrated by the use of that phrasing in the documents issued by the Constantinopolitan Council of 382. This assembly referred to the council held in the same city the previous year as "ecumenical," although it was only a gathering of bishops from the eastern half of the Roman Empire.<sup>4</sup> Besides, in a canon enacted by the same council, the phrase is used to characterize a council overstepping in its membership the boundary of a "civil diocese."<sup>5</sup> One should bear in mind that the term "οἰκουμενικός" does not convey a univocal meaning. It can designate an inhabited region, the Greek world, or the whole inhabited world. From the beginning of our era, it can also refer to the Roman Empire. For example, the noun "οἰκουμένη" is used with this connotation by the Evangelist Luke (2.1). Thus, one cannot be astonished if it took a long time until the phrase "οἰκουμενική σύνοδος" applied only to a very specific category of councils. In fact, as late as the first half of the sixth century, the Latin phrase "*Concilium universale*," actually referring to the plenary council of the African Episcopate, was rendered in Greeks as "οἰκουμενική σύνοδος."<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, by that time such a rendition was an anachronism. It did not accurately reflect the stage of the evolution of such a phrasing, since in the Byzantine East, a consensus on the external characteristics of an ecumenical council had already started to emerge.

From Late Antiquity onward, "Οἰκουμένη" tended to be synonymous with the Roman Empire, the sovereigns of which were considered as the only legitimate monarchs of the Universe.<sup>7</sup> Hence the adjective οἰκουμενικός expressed what was related to this Christian policy.

That the good estate of the Christian Empire rested on God's benevolence was taken for granted. Doctrinal issues, therefore, were not primarily regarded as a matter of individual persuasion. First

<sup>3</sup> H. E. Symonds, *The Church Universal and the See of Rome* (London, 1939), pp. 72-75. B. J. Kidd, *The Roman Primacy to A. D. 461* (London, 1936), pp. 45-46. P. C. K., pp. 45-46.

<sup>4</sup> Theodoret, H. E. V, g, 13, G. C. S. p. 293.

<sup>5</sup> Can. 6, *Fonti* ix, i, 1 (Rome, 1962), p. 52.

<sup>6</sup> "ad concilia . . . universalia" *epist. ad Papam, Caelestinum*, C. C, *Series Latina* CXLIX. Greek rendition: "εἰς οἰκουμενικὴν Σύνοδον," *Fonti*, *ibid.* 2, p. 434.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, vol. 2 (Washington, 1966), pp. 508-10.



and foremost, they were viewed as a matter affecting the Roman State. Defining orthodoxy was the task of the episcopate, but when controversies endangered the peace of Christendom, summoning an Ecumenical Council was the imperial duty. This idea is perfectly spelled out by Emperor Theodosios II in his letter convoking the Council of Ephesos.<sup>8</sup>

Undoubtedly, toward the very end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, the idea of what makes a council ecumenical took shape. Obviously, this should be related to the exceptional prestige the Council of Nicea had received. Then Nicea provided a posteriori basic criteria of conciliar ecumenicity.

The members of the Council of Ephesos (431) seemed to have had a clear consciousness of the ecumenical nature of their assembly. This fact is evidenced by the wording of the "*Acta*."<sup>9</sup> However, one must keep in mind the historical context: The Cyrillian Council intended to emphasize its legitimacy vis-à-vis the counter-synod presided over by John of Antioch, which was called by Saint Cyril and his followers a "conventicle of apostates."<sup>10</sup> By that time the convocation by the Emperor was deemed necessary for the ecumenicity of a council. Otherwise, it would be impossible to understand why Saint Cyril pressured Count Candidian into reading the imperial "*Sacra*" summoning the council.

As we have seen earlier, in Late Antiquity the concept of an Ecumenical Council lacked precision. At most, it indicates a large gathering of bishops. According to the Fathers of the Council held at Constantinople in 382, it refers to a synod including bishops of several civil dioceses. At all events, the above-mentioned rendition of "*concilium universale*" is inaccurate since this appellation there applied to the general council of a single civil diocese.

To what extent could the seven ecumenical councils claim to represent the Church Universal? We must avoid a simplistic answer based on a contemporary understanding of representativeness. When serious controversies arose in the pre-Constantinian era, the most significant attempt to reach a general consensus consisted in holding regional assemblies of bishops.<sup>11</sup> With the reign of Constantine, it

<sup>8</sup> A. C. O. 1, 1, 1, pp. 115-15.

<sup>9</sup> Can. 1, 3, 7, 8, Fonti, I, 1, pp. 57-65.

<sup>10</sup> Can. 1 "τῷ τῆς ἀποστασίας συνεδρίῳ," p. 58. Can. 2, pp. 58-59.

<sup>11</sup> Eusebios, H. E. 5, 22, 2, S. C. 41, p. 66.

became possible to hold interregional councils. However, in none of the seven ecumenical councils was a majority of the universal episcopate actually present. Even the lists of subscriptions have to be regarded with caution, since some were signatures by proxy and also some signatures were added later on. According to the calculation made by V. V. Bolotov, at the First Council of Nicea one sixth of the whole episcopate was present.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the representation of the West constituted a tiny minority and the same remark applies to the other ecumenical councils. We can only speculate on the fact that in Late Antiquity no rule dealing with representation for an ecumenical council had been formulated. Nevertheless, considering this fact as merely accidental would be hardly an acceptable hypothesis.

In early Christianity, the size of a synod was not regarded as the main factor of authority. If a synod was viewed as divinely inspired, its decisions were received as expressing the faith of the whole Church.<sup>13</sup> However, little by little, councils were ranked by categories. Indicating exactly the beginning and the end of such a process is not possible, but one can assume that it came to an end during the first third of the fifth century, i.e., before the summoning of the Council of Ephesos.

During the fourth to eighth centuries, no attempt was made to develop legislation bearing on the procedure and competence of an ecumenical council. In the canons, one can only find precise directions for the "provincial synod" presided over by the bishop of the metropolis. A whole set of rules dealt with the periodicity, competence, and procedure of such gatherings.<sup>14</sup> Some rules addressed the issue of "Larger Synods" as appellate courts for accused bishops.<sup>15</sup> Many councils held during Antiquity and the Middle Ages do not actually fall within any category mentioned in canon law. In the Byzantine East, therefore, canonists labeled as "local" (τοπικαί) all the synods not recognized as ecumenical but having been included in official canonical collections. Fr. George Florovsky (d. 1979) has argued that

<sup>12</sup>V. V. Bolotov, *Lektsi po Istorii Drevnei Tserkvi* (Petrograd, 1918), p. 24.

<sup>13</sup>R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1892), pp. 450-51.

<sup>14</sup>1 Nic. can. 5; Chalc. can. 19; Quinis. can. 8; 2 Nic. can. 6, *Fonti* 1, 1, pp. 27-28. On this topic, see René Metz: *L'institution synodale d'après les canons des synodes locaux (topiques)*, *Kanon*, 2 (Vienna, 1974), pp. 154-76.

<sup>15</sup>Ant. can. 12, 14; Sardica can. G. 14, *Fonti* 1, 2, p. 114, 115-16, 179-81. 1 Const. can. 6, *Fonti* 1, 1, pp. 49-53.

the complete lack of written rules with respect to ecumenical councils had a specific reason, viz., that those "councils were never regarded as a canonical institution, but rather as occasional *charismatic events*."<sup>16</sup> This viewpoint cannot be dismissed but needs qualification since attempts to describe the external attributes of an ecumenical council actually were made. Based on a widespread feeling, this phenomenon ought to be seen as a significant step in the elaboration of the concept of an ecumenical council. The necessary characteristics of such an assembly were set forth for the first time in an anonymous treatise probably published soon after the death of Emperor Justinian (565). This work has been critically edited by V. N. Benesevic.<sup>17</sup> According to the author of the treatise, in order to be reckoned as ecumenical, a council should meet the following requirements: 1) It must be summoned by the Emperor(s). 2) It must involve the entire episcopate of the Roman World (τὴν τῶν ρωμαίων πολιτείαν). The bishops should be either personally present or represented by proxy. 3) Matters of Faith must be at issue and, therefore, a dogmatic definition is to be promulgated.

Those requirements reflect the stereotyped views of the characteristics of the five councils recognized as ecumenical at that time in the Byzantine East.<sup>18</sup> That an ecumenical council had to be convened by imperial injunction (ἐκ κελεύσεων βασιλικῶν) was not a question in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Thus, for example, although Pope Leo the Great did not favor the gathering of a general council to rescind the decisions made by the "Robber Council" (Ephesos, 449), he did not oppose the imperial prerogative to summon an ecumenical council.<sup>19</sup> An ecumenical council was supposed to represent the episcopate of the Roman World. This, of course, should not be understood as restrictive, for, in the thinking of that time, all the bishops of the universe were formally considered as subjects of the Roman sovereign. With regard to actual represen-

<sup>16</sup>*Bible, Church Tradition: an Eastern Orthodox View*, vol. 1 (Belmont/Mass., 1972), p. 96.

<sup>17</sup>*Kanonicheskii Sbornik XIV Titulov* (St. Petersburg, 1905), pp. 71-79.

<sup>18</sup>We use the phrase "stereotyped views" because it includes the Council of Constantinople which formally did not fulfil the requirement of universality. On the subsequent reckoning of that synod among the Ecumenical Councils, see Metropolitan Pavlos Menevisoglou, *Ιστορική εισαγωγή εις τοὺς κανόνες τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* (Stockholm, 1990), pp. 198-201.

<sup>19</sup>"... vetris dispositionibus non reniton," Ep. A. C. O. 2, 4, p. 48.

tativeness, none of the seven ecumenical councils gathered more than a small part of the whole episcopate. The largest ecumenical assembly was the Council of Chalcedon which might have reached the approximate number of 510 bishops.<sup>20</sup> In fact, the Council of Constantinople in 381 was only an assembly of bishops from the Eastern part of the Empire. But the a posteriori reckoning of that synod as ecumenical constitutes an exception which will be explained below. Since the treatise was written after the reign of Emperor Justinian, one may be puzzled by the fact that there is no allusion to "Pentarchy" in connection with synodal representativeness. The idea of the supreme authority of the five "archbishops and patriarchs," viz., of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, comes initially from the decisions made by the Council of Chalcedon.<sup>21</sup> A century later, this was unequivocally spelled out in the Justinianic legislation.<sup>22</sup> In 691, the Council in *Trullo* canonically confirmed the pre-eminence of the five major sees of the "*Reichskirche*."<sup>23</sup> Notwithstanding, the necessary involvement of the five patriarchs in any council in order to be considered as ecumenical was not clearly set forth prior to the Iconoclastic controversy. The pentarchical argument was used by the Iconoclastic Council of 754<sup>24</sup> and indeed the Second Council of Nicea (787) tried to fulfil, as far as possible, the pentarchical requirement (Pope Hadrian sent two legates). Communications with the Eastern patriarchs under Muslim domination were almost impossible at that time. Nevertheless, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were formally represented by two "*syggkelloi*."<sup>25</sup>

To be reckoned as ecumenical, according to the author of the treatise, a council must address "problems of faith" and issue a dogmatic decree. Undoubtedly the seven ecumenical councils were involved in doctrinal matters. However, stating that each of them

<sup>20</sup>V. Laurent, "Le nombre des Peres du concile de Chalcedoine (451)," *Academie roumaine, Bulletin de la section historique*, V. 26.

<sup>21</sup>At the eighth session, the geographical extent of the Jerusalemite Patriarchate was delimited, A. C. O. 2, i, 3, pp. 86-99.

<sup>22</sup>*Nouvella* 131, 2, Schön and Kroll (Berlin, 1959), p. 655. See 6 Phidas, 'Ο Θεσμός τῆς Πενταρχίας τῶν Πατριάρχων, 2 (Athens, 1970), pp. 161-207.

<sup>23</sup>Can. 36, *Fonti*, 1, 1, p. 170.

<sup>24</sup>Saint Tarasios stated: "No universal council should be held without the consent of the other holy patriarchs," Mansi, 12, 991A.

<sup>25</sup>Pavlos Memenissoglou, pp. 306-07.

enacted a dogmatic decree needs qualification. The First Ecumenical Council issued an official symbol of faith known as "*Fides Nicaena*." The Council of Constantinople in 381 did not promulgate another profession of Faith. Actually, the Fathers of that synod unequivocally stated: "The faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers who met at Nicea in Bithynia shall not be set aside but shall remain firm . . ."<sup>26</sup> The reckoning of the Council of Constantinople, among the ecumenical ones, resulted from the approval of a creed attributed to that assembly at the Council of Chalcedon. The actual relation of that creed, known in modern times as "Niceno-Constantinopolitan," with the Council of 381 is, to say the least, very obscure.<sup>27</sup> At all events, this creed cannot be considered as being identical to the "brief decrees" mentioned by the Fathers of Constantinople in their address to Emperor Theodosios.<sup>28</sup> The Council of Ephesos in 431 dealt with matters of doctrine; it condemned the person and teachings of Nestorios. Nevertheless, the Synodal Fathers did not produce any definition. They proclaimed the sufficiency of the Nicene Symbol and even prohibited the composition and use of other formulas.<sup>29</sup> At first, the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon did not intend to enact a dogmatic decree, but Emperor Marcian did not share this view. He thought that only the promulgation of such a document would put to an end the ongoing Christological controversy. He eventually obtained satisfaction on this point.<sup>30</sup>

The Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) did not issue any new definition of faith. Its condemnation of the "Three Chapters" was intended to demonstrate that the Chalcedonian decree did not imply a hidden rehabilitation of Nestorianism.<sup>31</sup> The Sixth Ecumenical Council (681) enacted a decree of faith directed against Monothelitism.<sup>32</sup> In 787, the Second Council of Nicea, the last synod recognized as ecumenical both by Rome and Constantinople, issued a decree of faith setting

<sup>26</sup>Can. 1, Fonti, 1, 1, p. 45.

<sup>27</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1972), pp. 296-331.

<sup>28</sup>" . . . συντόμους ᾠδούς," V. N. Benesevic, *Syntagma XIV Titulorum* (Saint Petersburg, 1906), p. 95.

<sup>29</sup>"Dialalia" (= can. 7) Fonti, 1, 1, pp. 61-63.

<sup>30</sup>A. C. O. 2, 1, 2, pp. 126-30.

<sup>31</sup>*Anathemismi de tributes Capitulis*, A. C. O. e 4/1 pp. 240-44. The anathemas against Origen do not appear in the official minutes of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. About this fact, see Henri Crousel, *Origen* (New York, 1989), p. 47.

<sup>32</sup>Mansi, 11, 636A-40B.

forth the orthodox standpoint vis-à-vis the heretical views of the Iconoclasts.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, although three ecumenical councils out of the seven did not actually promulgate decrees of faith, one cannot question the fact that all of them investigated matters of doctrine. The idea that a council cannot be considered as ecumenical if it does not directly address dogmatic issues had an impact on the status of the Council *in Trullo*; the council called itself "ecumenical."<sup>34</sup> This assembly intended to legislate for the whole Church and since it had been summoned ten years after the Sixth Ecumenical Council, it was regarded as a continuation of that council. Its canons, therefore, were usually quoted as if they had been issued by the Sixth Ecumenical Council.<sup>35</sup>

In Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, one cannot find mention of enacting canons for the whole Church as a specific feature of ecumenical councils. Several factors explain this apparent anomaly. As we have seen above, the concept of an *Ecumenical Council* as a specific category of church synod did not take shape prior to the fifth century. Actually, the first canonical collections spread throughout Christendom without formal approvals by church authorities. In all likelihood, canon 1 of Chalcedon can be interpreted as the first formal approval of the "*Corpus Antiochenum adauctum*," which was overused during the sessions of that council. The first explicit and circumstantial approval of a canonical collection is found in canon 2 of the Council *in Trullo*.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, the idea that an Ecumenical Council necessarily must enact disciplinary canons is alien to the thought of the Ancient Church. In fact, neither the Third Ecumenical Council, nor the Fifth nor Sixth issued disciplinary canons. The canons of Ephesos, which from the sixth century appeared in the Byzantine collections, are drawn from the Encyclical of the Council and from decisions on specific issues made during various sessions. Those "canons" are lacking in the Western collections. However, in the Byzantine East during the High Middle Ages the concept of an Ecumenical Council seemed to include the enactment of disciplinary canons. Thus, the canons issued by the Council *in Trullo* were juridically related not only to the Sixth Ecumenical Council but

<sup>33</sup>Ibid. 13, 37D-380B

<sup>34</sup>*Address to Emperor Justinian 2*, Fonti 1, 2, p. 101.

<sup>35</sup>Pavlos Menevissoglou, p. 284.

<sup>36</sup>Fonti, 1, 1, pp. 120-25.

also to the Fifth. And as a result, toward the end of the twelfth century onward, the Council of 691 was referred to as "Πενθέκτη Σύνοδος" (Quinisextum), i.e., a continuation of the Fifth and Sixth Councils.<sup>37</sup>

What should be stated about the confirmation of the decisions made by a general council by the Emperor and the Pope? Since to be rated as ecumenical, a general council had to be summoned by the Emperor, it was also taken for granted that its decisions had to be ratified by the Emperor.<sup>38</sup> This procedure, however, should not be misinterpreted. Formulating doctrinal decrees was considered as the exclusive prerogative of the hierarchy. This point is evidenced by abundant historical data. All attempts to solve dogmatic issues merely by imperial authority were ineffective. Thus, with respect to decisions made by an ecumenical council, one sees a clear difference between the approval by the members of the council and by the assent of the Emperor. This fact is well illustrated in the subscriptions of the decree issued by the Sixth Ecumenical Council.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, the confirmation by the Emperor was a practical necessity: Thereby conciliar enactments got the status of compulsory laws of the Empire.

To understand the significance of the approval of conciliar decisions by the Roman See, one should take into account that the period under scrutiny (325-787) does not historically constitute a homogeneous unit. Great differences existed, both in the way Rome used to understand its involvement in ecumenical councils at the beginning of that period and toward the end, and on the perception of the role of Rome during this span of time in the East.

The absence of Pope Sylvester at the First Nicene Council, caused by fortuitous circumstances, viz., old age and poor health, created a precedent; the Roman See was represented by papal legates. This situation brought about for the first time a real problem at the Council of Chalcedon. The formal approval of the conciliar decisions by the Pope were anxiously expected. The legates had strongly opposed the

<sup>37</sup>V. Laurent thought that this term had been coined by Balsamon: "L'oeuvre canonique de concile in Trullo (691-92)," *Revue des Etudes byzantines*, 23 (1965) 17. Pavlos Menevissoglou thinks that this term was already in use, p. 285.

<sup>38</sup>See the address of the Council of Constantinople in 381 to Emperor Theodosius. The members of that Council asked the sovereign, "Ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῆς συνόδου τῆν φηρον," V. N. Benesovic, *Syntagma*, p. 95.

<sup>39</sup>The bishops stated: "Ὅπως ὑπέγραψα." Emperor Constantine IV stated: "Ἀνέγνωμεν καὶ συνητάμεν," Mansi, 5, 11, pp. 640-56. Defining is the exclusive right of the episcopate.

motion on the See of Constantinople, but the Emperor and the Archbishop of Constantinople hoped that Pope Leo would not be so adamant and would recognize the prerogatives bestowed on the See of "New Rome" at the last conciliar session. The Pope eventually gave his answer: he approved the doctrinal definition issued by the Council but flatly denied the validity of the motion about the canonical position of the See of Constantinople.<sup>40</sup>

At first, Pope Vigilius opposed the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" issued by the Second Council of Constantinople (553) but eventually changed his mind and accepted the conciliar decisions.<sup>41</sup> The dogmatic decree enacted by the Sixth Ecumenical Council (681), with the posthumous condemnation of Pope Honorius was ratified by Pope Leo II (682-684) who, however, tried subtly to downgrade the guilt of Honorius.<sup>42</sup> The canons issued by the Council in *Trullo* were at first rejected by Rome. A *modus vivendi* apparently was reached in 711 during the visit of Pope Constantine I in the East. From indirect evidence, one might infer that the Pope approved those Trullan Canons which did contravene the rule and customs of the Roman Church.<sup>43</sup> Be that as it may, the canons of the Council in *Trullo* had little impact on Western Christendom. The venerable Bede went so far as to call the Quinisextum "*synodus erratica*."<sup>44</sup>

With respect to the Second Council of Nicea held in 787, Pope Hadrian I received a letter notifying him of the synodal decisions. No formal confirmation was requested, since the papal agreement had been expressed by the Roman legates. Actually, Hadrian concurred with the doctrinal statement issued by the Council but was indignant at the fact that Illyricum and Southern Italy were not returned to the Western Patriarchate.<sup>45</sup> Can one draw, on the basis of evidential materials, incontrovertible conclusions about the significance of the papal approval of the decisions made by the "Seven Ecumenical Councils?"

<sup>40</sup>A. C. O. 2, 4, Epist. 104, p. 57; Epist. 105, pp. 57-59; Epist. 106, pp. 59-62. Those letters are respectively addressed to Emperor Marcian, Empress Pulcheria, and "Bishop" Anatolios.

<sup>41</sup>H. E. Symonds, pp. 166-80.

<sup>42</sup>Mansi, 11, 733A.

<sup>43</sup>Constance Head, *Justinian II of Byzantium* (Madison, 1972), pp. 132-36.

<sup>44</sup>*De Sex Aetatibus*, M. G. H., A. A., vol. 13 (Berlin, 1898), p. 316.

<sup>45</sup>PL 98, 1292.



As mentioned above, this period does not constitute a homogeneous unit. Thus, one should take into account the progressive making of the concept of an Ecumenical Council. In the inceptive stage (fourth century), no precise norm about the make-up of such a Church Assembly existed. The concept took shape in the second stage (fifth-seventh centuries). The approval of the Roman See was considered to be very important for the acknowledgement of a council as truly ecumenical. The pressure brought on Pope Vigilius exemplifies this assertion. Let us also keep in mind the efforts made by Emperor Justinian II to reach an agreement with Rome about the Council in *Trullo*. In the Byzantine East, however, a clear-cut distinction was established between “*Sedes*” and “*Sedens*,” i.e., between the See and the holder of the See. The third stage encompasses the whole age of the Iconoclastic controversy (726-843). After the pseudo-council of Hiercia (754), the iconophile party pointed out the irregularity of such a synod on the basis of the opposition of the Roman Church and of the Melkite patriarchates. The position of Rome was emphasized within the framework of pentarchy.<sup>46</sup>

Byzantine Emperors and Patriarchs of Constantinople usually seemed to have been anxious to get the approval of the Roman See for the decisions issued by a council claiming ecumenicity. First and foremost, the Bishop of Rome was canonically and legally recognized as the Patriarch of the West. Hence, his approval was supposed to signify the adhesion of the Western half of the catholic Church. This was the official position in Byzantium. Actually, this canonical stand, encapsulated in the principle of Pentarchy, did not always reflect the real situation. For example, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, albeit approved by Pope Vigilius, encountered serious opposition in the West and even brought about a schism affecting the northern part of Italy. This schism lasted for at least half a century.<sup>47</sup> Likewise, the Frankish Church took a firm stand against the Second Nicene Council, in spite of the agreement of Pope Hadrian to the doctrinal definition issued by that assembly. This opposition lay on two grounds: The Franks did not accept the veneration of the images and, besides, they denied the ecumenicity of a council where they had not been represented.<sup>48</sup> This means that they did not regard the agreement

<sup>46</sup>St. Stephen the New, PG 100.1144; John the Deacon, Mansi, 12, 108E; Basil of Ancyra, *ibid.* 12, 1007.

<sup>47</sup>Symonds, po. 178.

<sup>48</sup>Klaus Schatz, *Écumenicité du concile et structure de l'Eglise a Nicee II et*

expressed by the Pope as tantamount to the approval of the entire Western Church.

The Bishop of Rome was not only the Patriarch of the West, but also the first hierarch of the Church universal. This was not questioned in Byzantium and was even spelled out in the Justinianic legislation.<sup>49</sup> Studying all the implications and limitations of this primacy during the period under investigation would lie far beyond the scope of the present paper. We must circumscribe our inquiry to the impact of this primacy in the process of recognition of a council as ecumenical. It is worthy of note that from the fifth century onward, papal approval of the decisions made by an ecumenical council was differently perceived in Rome than in the East. In Rome, this was regarded as a confirmation while, in the East, it was understood as an adhesion.<sup>50</sup>

Another point ought to be taken into consideration: the approval of doctrinal definitions by the Pope was held to be very important insofar as it meant that the Faith was identical in both parts of Christianity. About matters merely bearing on church order, papal assent was, of course, highly desired; nevertheless, when popes disagreed on such matters, this usually was not taken into account. For example, canon 28 of Chalcedon was quietly implemented in spite of the adamant opposition of Pope Leo. Also, the entire legislation issued by the Council *in Trullo* became the fundamental source of Byzantine canon law. As another example, let us mention the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Pope Hadrian stated that he was not ready to approve globally that council unless Illyricum and South Italy would be returned to his jurisdiction. The Byzantines completely ignored this demand.

Our inquiry into the making of the concept of an ecumenical council during the period under investigation highlights some aspects of this process. Nonetheless, historical evidence shows that the eventual reckoning of a council as "ecumenical" neither automatically derives from the size of its membership nor from the geographic representativeness of such an assembly. This does not mean that those

dans les Livres Carolins, Nicee II 787-1987 (Paris, 1987), pp. 263-70. Judith Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1987), pp. 426-28.

<sup>49</sup>Novella 9, C. J. C. iii, p. 91; Nov. 131, *ibid.* p. 655.

<sup>50</sup>J. Gaudement, *La formation du droit seculier et du droit de l'Eglise aux ive et ve siecles*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1979), pp. 158-59.

factors were regarded as negligible. For example, at Ephesos in 431 the counter-synod presided over by John of Antioch and composed of only fifty-three bishops was unable to prevail over the Cyrillian council composed of one hundred and ninety bishops, which moreover had the support of Rome. In the same city, eight years later, a new council of approximately one hundred and thirty bishops presided over by Dioskoros of Alexandria claimed to be ecumenical and was recognized for a time as such by imperial authority. However, irregularities of procedure and the violence which took place at this assembly gave rise to a negative reaction in the mainstream of the Church. The name of "*latrocinium*" (robber council) was coined by Pope Leo himself.<sup>51</sup> The Iconoclastic Council of Hieria in 754, albeit consisting of no less than three hundred and fifty-eight bishops, hardly could claim even an external character of ecumenicity. Not only were neither the Pope nor the three Eastern patriarchs represented at that assembly, but they also shared a strong hostility toward Iconoclasm.

With respect to the period under investigation, all those councils which deviated from the right way exhibited notorious external deficiencies in spite of temporary imperial support. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, neither a large attendance, the representation of the five Patriarchates, regularity of procedure, nor imperial endorsement and support necessarily led to a general or quasi-general reception of conciliar decisions bearing on doctrinal matters. This assertion is exemplified by the case of the Fourth Ecumenical Council. Although this synod had fulfilled all the external requirements of genuine ecumenicity, its doctrinal definition was strongly challenged throughout the Christian East. For centuries it remained a source of conflict. Only nowadays the dialogue between non-Chalcedonian and Chalcedonian churches seems to bring about some positive results.

To be sure, the ultimate criterion of validity for an ecumenical council does not lie in external notes. The correctness of a doctrinal statement issued by an ecumenical council comes from internal factors which, at least in principle, can be easily determined. A new definition must be in full agreement with the immutable faith of the Church. During the period under investigation, heretical teachings were invariably viewed either as a blatant novelty or as the resurgence of

<sup>51</sup>Epist. 95, A. C. O., 2, 3, 1, p. 51: ". . . non iudicio sed latrocinio."

an old heresy. In such a perspective, the function of the magisterium was to articulate explicitly some points of Church doctrine distorted by heretics. This principle of consistency is spelled out clearly by Saint Maximos the Confessor: "The pious rule of the Church evidences the fact that the holy and accepted councils are those characterized by the accuracy of their doctrine."<sup>52</sup> From a purely theological viewpoint, this criterion is irrefutable. However, with our contemporary knowledge of the development of dogmas, when we take a retrospective look at the past it appears that resorting to the principle of consistency does not always provide an easy answer. To be sure, Christian Antiquity did not completely ignore the existence of a certain form of doctrinal development.<sup>53</sup> Notwithstanding, Church Fathers were more prone to underscore the immutability of the Faith throughout the ages. No one, of course, questioned the above-mentioned principle of consistency, but the opponents of a definition produced by a general council used to contest the fact that the newly promulgated dogma reflected the immutable Faith of the phenomenon of "reception" with respect to doctrinal definitions issued by councils claiming ecumenicity.<sup>54</sup> If we focus our attention on the period under review, we can note that in the process of "reception" several factors were at work. We also can observe that, to a certain extent, the progressive elaboration of the concept of an ecumenical council played a significant role. To exemplify this assertion, suffice it to notice the differences between the First and the Fourth Ecumenical Councils. One could think that, from the very beginning, the Nicene Creed ("*Fides Nicaena*") and more especially the phrase "ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ" would be the rallying formula of the orthodox. However, as has been convincingly shown by J. N. D. Kelly, for at least three decades, this was not the case.<sup>55</sup> During this span of time, several creeds were composed by councils which cannot be considered as Arianizing assemblies.<sup>56</sup> But in the fifth cen-

<sup>52</sup>Acta, 2, 12, PG 90.148A.

<sup>53</sup>Saint Gregory the Theologian, *Orat.* 31, 26-27, PG 36.161C-164B. See also Maurice Wiles, *The Making of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, 1967).

<sup>54</sup>See, for example G. Denzler, "The Authority and the Reception of Conciliar Decisions in Christendom," *Concilium* 167 (Edinburgh and New York, 1983), pp. 13-8. In the Orthodox Church, the rejection of the Council of Florence (1439) has stimulated reflective theology on the topic of Conciliar reception.

<sup>55</sup>Kelly, *Creeds*, pp. 254-62.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid. pp. 263-74.

tury, when the concept of an ecumenical council had already taken shape, the situation looked quite different. This change is reflected in the attitude vis-à-vis the Chalcedonian definition. Strict adherence to the whole statement including, of course, the controversial phrase “ἐν δύο φύσεσιν” was regarded from the beginning as the touchstone of orthodoxy.<sup>57</sup> A large segment of the clergy and people in the Christian East spurned this definition. As has been shown above, those opponents were not at all impressed by the external notes of ecumenicity of the Chalcedonian Council. They justified their opposition on the assumption that the council's definition was at variance with the teaching of Saint Cyril as vindicated by the council at Ephesos. In other words, according to their view, Chalcedon did not fulfill the ultimate requirement for reception, viz., “doctrinal consistency.”

We have alluded to the manifold factors at work in the process of reception. In fact, historical data do not provide simple answers since theological, ecclesiastical and political factors often were deeply intermingled. At all events, one must resist the tendency to overvalue systematically the weight of *non-theological factors* and to minimize the significance of the religious issues at stake. Such an approach does not bear up under close scrutiny. For example, in the lengthy doctrinal controversies of the fourth century, the role of Caesaropapism should not be grossly exaggerated. Speaking of the emperors of that time, S. L. Greenslade rightly states: “Broadly, they supported that party which either was already in the majority or appeared most capable of winning general support.”<sup>58</sup> Another stereotype should be dismissed; the controversy over the images did not spring out from an alleged clash between a Semitic aversion of pictorial representation and an Hellenistic inclination for images.<sup>59</sup>

The opposition to the Chalcedonian definition was not brought about at first by political or ethnic factors but by the different approaches of the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools. On the other hand, the situation quickly became far more complex because, then, political and ethnic factors started to be intrinsically mixed with

<sup>57</sup>R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1953), pp. 254-301. At Chalcedon, the tentative draft of the conciliar definition contained the phrase, “ἐκ δύο φύσεων.” This wording was opposed by several bishops of the Diocese of “Oriens” and by the papal legates. A. C. O., 2, 1, 2, pp. 121-30.

<sup>58</sup>*Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius* (London, 1954), p. 17.

<sup>59</sup>Peter Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Los Angeles, 1982), pp. 251-301.

Christological issues.<sup>60</sup> Thenceforth, with some exceptions, the demarcation line between upholders and adversaries of the Chalcedonian definition overlapped that of national entities. Eventually, Chalcedonian orthodoxy tended to be identified with loyalty to "Romanitas." Outside the Eastern borders of the Empire the members of the Chalcedonian minority were called "Melkites" (from the Syriac adjective "malkaya") i.e., "Emperor's men."

The length of time for a definition issued by an ecumenical council to be received in and assimilated by the mainstream of the Church often depended on the chronological position of such a council within the framework of the debates on the doctrinal issue at stake. Let us give some examples. The First Nicene Council took place at the beginning of the Arian controversy. But the Nicene Creed got large support throughout the whole Church when the real significance of the "ὁμοούσιον" was elicited by the Cappadocian Fathers. In the protracted Christological crisis, something analogous happened. In the Byzantine church, the Chalcedonian definition became acceptable to a large majority after the clarifications brought about by the so-called Neo-Chalcedonian theologians. Unfortunately, this came too late to have an impact on the Oriental churches which considered Chalcedon as an abomination.

The Sixth Ecumenical Council took place at the end of the Monothelite controversy. Theologically, the orthodox had already won out, thanks mostly to the deeds and writings of Saint Maximos the Confessor (d. 662). During his short reign, Emperor Philippikos (711-713) tried to resurrect Monothelitism. The attempt was futile. The Second Council of Nicea was held in the middle of the controversy about the images. Since this issue had become critical in the twenties of the eighth century, the two parties had already expressed their positions. The arguments against pictorial representations had been spelled out by the Council of Hieria and the Iconophiles had the opportunity to make their point which was endorsed by the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Thus, the second period of Iconoclasm (813-843) was theologically marked by inherent weakness.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup>A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 (Baltimore, 1986), pp. 1034-35. John Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (Crestwood, 1989), pp. 260-90.

<sup>61</sup>G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969), pp. 202-03. Warren Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival (780-842)* (Stanford, 1988), pp. 207-14.

Normally, the final stage in the acceptance of a council as genuinely "ecumenical" came with its acknowledgement as such by subsequent general councils and the integration of its doctrinal decisions into Church "kerygma." This process is clearly evidenced for the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Ecumenical Councils. With regard to the First Ecumenical Council, the problem looks somewhat different. To be sure, the "Nicene Faith" was solemnly confirmed by the Council of Constantinople in 381, which actually was not an ecumenical council according to the criteria subsequently set up. Nevertheless, the Council of Constantinople actually represented the Eastern Church. In the West, the pro-Nicene party was overly predominant and the Nicene Creed had the approval of Rome and all the major Sees. The Council of Constantinople was implicitly recognized as ecumenical by the Easterners at Chalcedon and by the Papacy toward the beginning of the sixth century.<sup>62</sup> Since the Seventh Ecumenical Council is the last of the series, it could not have received formal recognition from a subsequent ecumenical council. The definitive return of the Byzantine Church to orthodoxy took place in 843. This was made official by the Standing Synod (Σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα). Eventually, the general Council of *Hagia-Sophia* (879-880) which includes legates of the Roman See, fully recognized the ecumenicity of the Second Council of Nicea.<sup>63</sup>

We have seen that the shaping of the concept of an ecumenical council as a specific category of synod started with the First Council of Nicea. By and large, this process came to an end in the fifth century. From that time, the criteria were retrospectively applied to those councils which in the past were supposed to have fulfilled the norm and thenceforth to the councils fulfilling it.

The aforementioned anonymous treatise composed toward the end of the sixth century probably expresses the views of some Byzantine milieus. However, the characteristics of ecumenicity are actually based on the conventional representation of the five councils regarded as ecumenical at that time in the Byzantine East. Thus, it included the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 which did not meet the first two criteria for ecumenicity because, as has been mentioned already, it was an interdiocesan council of the Eastern Part of the Empire. Also at that time, it was taken for granted that the main purpose of

<sup>62</sup>Cf. note 18 above.

<sup>63</sup>Pavlos Menevissoglou, p. 505.

that council had been to condemn the heresy of the "Pneumatomachi" and consequently to extend the text of the Nicene Creed.<sup>64</sup> It also included the Council of Constantinople in 553, although the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" can hardly be considered as a definition of Faith. Furthermore, the anathemas against Origenism do not appear in the official minutes of that council. Regarding the requirement of universality, it looks more like an ideal goal than a practical reality. Paradoxically, the emphasis on universality was mainly articulated toward the end of the period under review; it was used by the Iconophiles in order to emphasize the external defectiveness of the Council of Hieria. By that time, however, the concept of "Pentarchy," which was supposed to embody this universality, had become artificial: The Melkite patriarchates were isolated and the Western Church had already ceased to consider herself as a part of the Byzantine polity. Significantly, this political rupture became patent with the coronation of Charlemagne thirteen years after the gathering of the Second Nicene Council. As has been already stated, on the level of general history, the "age of the seven Ecumenical Councils" does not constitute a homogeneous unit. Notwithstanding, speaking of such an age is not to be viewed as an arbitrary utterance because this period is characterized by some traits we can find neither earlier nor later. The First Nicene Council gathered less than a year after Constantine had become the sole master of the Roman World<sup>65</sup> and the Seventh Ecumenical Council took place thirteen years before the formal political break-up between the Byzantine East and Western Europe.<sup>66</sup>

Beyond any doubt, one can discern a logical continuity in the work achieved by the seven Ecumenical Councils, since they have elicited the dogmatic teaching of the Church with regard to Trinitarian theology, Christology, and thereby Soteriology. This appears to be obvious for the first six ecumenical councils. At the inceptive stage of the controversy on pictorial representations, it was not self-evident. Very soon, however, Christological arguments were brought to the fore by both sides. Thus, the Second Nicene Council took very seriously

<sup>64</sup>See our article (Pierre, L'Huilier) "Faits et fiction a propos du deuxieme concile oecumenique," *Eglise et Theologie*, 13 (1982) 151-56.

<sup>65</sup>Robert M. Grant, *Augustus to Constantine* (San Francisco, 1990), p. 239.

<sup>66</sup>W. Treadgold correctly states: "In Byzantine eyes, as the pope and Charlemagne must have known, the coronation was nothing less than an act of rebellion against the imperial government," p. 117.



into account the Christological aspect of the doctrine at stake. Furthermore, the council emphasized the significance of Church tradition. Also, one cannot ignore the work of the Seven Ecumenical Councils with respect to Church order. The First Nicene Council set up the basis of a universally accepted "Written Law." The Trullan Synod, regarded in the East as a legitimate continuation of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, codified Byzantine canon law. Canon 1 of the Second Nicene Council confirmed this codification.<sup>67</sup>

The uniqueness of the seven Ecumenical Councils results from the convergence of historical factors which only existed during that span of time. Those factors are related to the relations between Church and State, or, to be more accurate, between priesthood and imperial authority within the framework of the Christian polity. Although, from the beginning historians note on this matter a difference of viewpoint between the two halves of Christendom, we do not think that such a tendency was really consequential until the end of the seventh century.<sup>68</sup> The eighth century undoubtedly was a time of profound mutation in the relation between the Byzantine state and the Papacy. Yet, concerning the Second Council of Nicea, the pattern of the past was formally retained.

Initially, the concept of an ecumenical council as a specific synodal category was vague. Toward the eighties of the fourth century, this phrase was utilized to describe a synod including bishops from several "civil dioceses" in contrast to a "larger synod" composed of the episcopate of a province with the addition of some bishops coming from neighboring provinces of the same "diocese" (μεἱζωνι συνόδῳ τῆς διοικήσεως ἐκείνης ἐπισκόπων).<sup>69</sup> Church legislation intended to forbid recourse to an Ecumenical Council for trivial matters.<sup>70</sup> Thereby, this stricture enhanced the status of an ecumenical council. At the same time, the decline and fall of the various kinds of Arianism in the Roman Empire increased the prestige of "the Great and Holy Council" of Nicea. Then the Council of Nicea, or more

<sup>67</sup>Fonti, 1, 1, pp. 245-48.

<sup>68</sup>Fr. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1979), pp. 85-100; Yves Congar, *L'ecclésiologie du haut Moyen-Age* (Paris, 1968), pp. 253-59 and 344-47.

<sup>69</sup>Const. can. 6. Fonti, 1, 1, p. 52; cf. Antioch can. 12, *ibid.* 2, p. 114; can. 14, pp. 115-16. On the composition of the "Larger synod" see Karl Müller, *Kanon 2 und 6 von Konstantinopel 381 und 382, Festgabe für Adolf Julicher* (Tubingen, 1927), pp. 190-202.

<sup>70</sup>Const. can. 6, Fonti, 1, 1, p. 52.

accurately its idealized image, provided the perfect model of what an ecumenical council must be.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The modern category of "citizen" rather than "believer" poses a problem for the unified community of Islam. The national order and authority in Muslim countries in the past was established by Islam; but now, in modern times, the society is pluralistic and sometimes Muslims find themselves to be in the minority. It is significant, however, that "the house of Islam was a political, territorial concept, not a racial one" (p. 216).

The book is a very good introduction to Islam, especially as a university text. It contains a glossary of terms and an index which are helpful to the reader. The presentation is very objective and gives a fair treatment of the faith and practice of the Islamic religion.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

*The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787).* By Leo Donald Davis. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987. Pp. 342.

The present study is written to fill the gap in English of political and theological expression of the seven ecumenical councils.

The author, a Jesuit Catholic theologian, successfully presents the historical, political, and theological story of the seven ecumenical councils. The author recognizes the importance of these councils for the "Orthodox Churches and the main Protestant Churches" and that they "accept only these seven as truly ecumenical expressions of Christian faith . . ." (p. 9). To indicate that "the First Seven Ecumenical Councils" and "only these seven as truly ecumenical," clearly points to the fact that the author is prejudiced on behalf of the Roman West. Also an indication of this is his constant reference to papal authority as dominant over East and West during the period of the Councils. Other than these strong positions, the author presents a good study of the seven ecumenical councils.

He begins with an excellent chapter on the political and cultural background of the birth of Christianity. The implications of the Roman emperors as defenders of the gods and the Greek literary character of the religious beliefs, as well as the rivalry of the mystery religions, made an insurmountable task for Christianity to freely develop and bring to fruition their theological expression.

The author points out that the Christian community was united by Christ and expressed this unity in the person and office of the

bishop. With the ascent of Constantine, the Christian religion found itself free to develop its doctrine. This gave impetus to the great and ecumenical councils that defined the Christian faith.

The book discusses the Ecumenical Councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesos (431), Chalcedon (451), Constantinople (553), Constantinople (680), and Nicaea (787). The study of these councils has implications for today's discussion between Christians, including Orthodox Chalcedonians and pre-Chalcedonians, as well as between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic West.

Each chapter begins with the political and cultural setting and the doctrinal issues that were debated in each period. The terms are explained so as to be understood by both East and West and amplified for today's Christian understanding.

The greatest value of this volume is that it places each council under discussion within the political cultural context. It brings together a great deal of research and presents its findings in a scholarly, comprehensive way that is most useful to the scholar and student of church history.

The book is well documented, including a helpful bibliography, glossary of theological terms, chronology, and indices. The bibliography includes numerous Orthodox studies, demonstrating that the author makes every effort to present the objective historical truth.

My reluctance to fully endorse this study lies in his overemphasis on papal authority.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## The Formation of the Unalaska Parish, 1762-1824<sup>\*</sup>

---

S. A. MOUSALIMAS

WHEN IVAN VENIAMINOV ARRIVED AS THE FIRST PARISH PRIEST, THE Aleut laity of the Unalaska parish were already conducting Orthodox services that did not require clergy. Throughout his ministry from 1824 to 1834, whenever he made pastoral visits to the villages that comprised this parish, he conducted those sacraments that require an ordained minister: chrismation, confession, and communion. This is evident in his journals where he recorded the sacraments he had ministered. To marry, he "sacramentally blessed" the couple (a phrase from his journals). In other words, he performed the marriage ceremony for a couple who had already been bonded through local customs. Rarely did he baptize: he would chrismate those who had been newly baptized by others. Very rarely did he bury: he would sometimes lead a memorial service. Only at the harbor village on Unalaska Island where he himself remained most of the year, did he conduct baptisms and funerals regularly. Elsewhere the village laity were ministering these sacraments themselves, throughout the vast parish.

Indeed the parish was vast. It extended along the Aleutian Islands from Unalaska Island eastward to Unga Island and the tip of the Alaska Peninsula, westward to Unmak Island; and northward to encompass the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea. Veniaminov made

---

<sup>\*</sup>This article is adapted from section 3 (the third of five sections) of the Introduction to "The Journals of Ivan Veniaminov: Unalaska and Sitka, 1823-1836" (cited below as: Veniaminov, *Journals*), to be published in the Rasumson Library Historical Translation Series, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

pastoral visits to various locations through this enormous parish during the summer and spring months of this decade. During autumns and winters, he remained mostly in Unalaska's harbor village.

Yet Veniaminov was the parish's first priest. How had this parish come into being? The formation of the Unalaska parish was a development by the laity beginning three generations prior to Veniaminov's arrival. This can be explained with reference to: a chronology of the clergy prior to him; social dynamics that brought forth Eastern Orthodox leadership; and the merging of faith and polity.

### *Chronology of Clergy Prior to Veniaminov.*

No clergyman had been assigned as a missionary to the Aleutian Islands before Fr. Ivan Veniaminov arrived as the parish priest in 1824, except one who served a year, from summer 1795 to summer 1796: the hieromonk (priest-monk) Makarii whose ministry was located mainly on Unalaska Island.<sup>1</sup>

Other clergy in transit had made brief landfalls at Unalaska Island, the port-of-call for east-west voyages between Okhotsk-Kamchatka and Kodiak/Sitka, and for north-south voyages between the north Pacific and the Bering Sea. Their combined total of time amounted to less than a year. A chronology is provided below:

a) Briefly in 1790: Fr. Vasilii Sivtsov, chaplain to the *Slava Rossii*, Billings/Sarychev expedition, performed baptisms and marriages.<sup>2</sup>

b) Two days in September 1794: missionaries in transit from Okhotsk to Kodiak Island stopped at Unalaska. They also harbored through inclement weather at a remote bay. They performed baptisms.<sup>3</sup>

c) A week in July 1807: hieromonk Gideon in transit from Kodiak to Okhotsk performed baptisms, chrismations, and marriages at Unalaska.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For Makarii, see p. 32 below.

<sup>2</sup> Gavril A. Sarychev [Gawrila Saryschew], *Account of Voyage of Discovery to the North-east of Siberia, the Frozen Ocean and the Northeast Sea* (London, 1807), 2, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Archimandrite Ioasaph, 19 May 1795, Synodal Archive 643:48, Yudin Collection, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress; Herman to Nazarii, May 1795, in Michael Oleksa, ed., *Alaskan Missionary Spirituality* (NY, 1987), p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> *The Round the World Voyage of Hieromonk Gideon, 1803-1809*, trans. Lydia T. Black, ed. Richard A. Pierce (Kingston, Ont. and Fairbanks, AK, 1989), pp. 131-43; Richard A. Pierce, *Russian-America: A Biographical Dictionary* (Kingston, Ont. and Fairbanks, AK, 1990), p. 161.



d) Briefly during a period in June 1820, at the end of August 1820, and mid-June 1821: Fr. Mikhail Ivanov chaplain to the Vasil'ev/Shishmarev circumnavigational expedition, on the *Blagonamerennii*, might have landed while that vessel was anchored in the Unalaska harbor.<sup>5</sup>

e) August 1824: Veniaminov arrived as the parish priest and recorded nearly the same list of clergy in the region before him, but without the chronological details.<sup>6</sup>

In summary, prior to Veliaminov's arrival a single missionary had been assigned who had served for a year. Otherwise, chaplains and missionaries in transit had made landfalls at Unalaska Island for a combined total of less than a year. The total combined time of all clergymen before Veniaminov's arrival thus amounted to less than two years.

### *Social Dynamics that Brought Forth Aleut Leaders.*

The interval between the first baptism in the Unalaska region in 1762 and Veniaminov's arrival as the first parish priest in 1824, three generations later, had been punctuated sporadically by clergy for two years or less, mainly on a single island, Unalaska. Yet when Veniaminov arrived sacraments were already being performed by laity throughout the region; and he was assigned as the priest of an existing parish — a parish comprised of Aleut villages, or polities.

The history in the neighboring Atka parish is even more impressive in this respect. Encompassing the central and western Aleutian Islands, this region knew its first baptism by 1747. Four generations later in 1828 the first clergyman Fr. Iakov Netsvetov arrived, likewise assigned as the parish priest. Yet never had a clergyman been in these regions prior to him; and he himself had roots here: his mother, Maria, was an Atkan Aleut.

How had such Orthodox leadership developed prior to the arrival of parish priests? Intermarriage was one social dynamic that brought it forth. An example is provided by the parents of Fr. Netsvetov. His mother Maria Alekseeva from Atka married his father Egor Vasil'evich

<sup>5</sup> N. A. Ivashintsov, *Russian Round-the-World Voyages, 1803-1849*, trans. Glynn R. Barratt, ed. Richard A. Pierce (Kingston, Ont., 1980), p. 141.

<sup>6</sup> Ivan Veniaminov, *Notes of the Islands of the Unalashka District*, trans. Lydia T. Black and R. H. Geoghegan, ed. Richard A. Pierce (Kingston, Ont., 1984), p. 238. He overlooked only point (b) in the chronology: the missionaries in transit to Kodiak.

from Tobolsk, a man of particular piety.<sup>7</sup> He had arrived in 1794 within the second generation following the first baptisms on the central and eastern Aleutians. The couple was married according to local customs; and their first child Iakov was born in 1804. In July 1807, they had their marriage blessed sacramentally by hieromonk Gideon; the only priest in this region since 1796, he had landed at Unalaska for a week while journeying from Kodiak to Okhotsk. It is significant that the couple sought him. They received an anointing with blessed oil from him, as well. At that date, Egor was thirty four years old and Maria was in her 20s, according to Gideon's records.<sup>8</sup> They raised a family of six children on Saint George, Pribilof Islands, a location that eventually became part of the Unalaska parish. All their children distinguished themselves: one son as a master shipwright; another as a navigator; one daughter as the wife of a company manager at Sitka; another as the wife of a Russian-Aleut educated at Petersburg; and the eldest son Iakov as a graduate of the Irkutsk seminary, then as the first priest of the Atka parish (1828-1844). Later he became the first clergy missionary to the Yukon and Kuskokwin River regions (1844-1863).

The leadership this marriage brought forth was bilingual. Netsvetov translated into Atkan Aleut and cooperated with Veniaminov in creating an alphabet based on the Cyrillic for the Aleut languages. Netsvetov instructed the next generation of parish priests for both the Atka and Unalaska parishes: Fr. Lavrentii Salamatov and Fr. Innokentii Shaiashnikov. These men who also derived from Aleut-Russian intermarriages were fluently bilingual: they translated scriptures and authored original work in Atkan and Unalaskan Aleut respectively.

A fact has been indicated that deserves attention. From the beginning the priests had kinship ties within the parishes. Netsvetov,

<sup>7</sup>Appendix 3, Inscription on the Gravestone of Egor Vasil'evich Netsvetov, in *The Journals of Iakov Netsvetov: The Atka Years, 1828-1841*, trans. Lydia T. Black (Kingston, Ont. 1980), 271. For first baptisms, see e.g. p. below.

<sup>8</sup>*Voyage of Gideon*, pp. 137-38, 141. Gideon administered chrismation instead of Holy Communion, because he was without an antimins. For Maria's age, cf. (ibid.) where she is listed as twenty, with (ibid. 132) where she is listed as twenty-five. Notice (ibid. 132) that Maria is recorded among the "children born to Russian promyshlennye." Was she a Russian-Aleut herself, with her marriage arranged through the comradery of Egor with her father (whose name would be Vasilei as indicated by her patronymic)? If this is the case, then the original intermarriage would have taken place in her parents' generation: very early indeed, with lasting effect in Alaska.

Salamatov, and Shaiashnikov were raised and were kindred on islands where they served. A foreigner intervened between Shaiashnikov and Veniaminov: Fr. Golovin, a Kamchadal. As for Veniaminov who had come from Irkutsk, he became competently bilingual and he developed kinship ties through the marriage of a brother to an Aleut woman and the marriage of a daughter to a Russian-Aleut man. The combination of dual kinship and dual language (Aleut-Russian) must have been instrumental to the communication and indigenization of this faith, instrumental to its implanting from Asia and engrafting in the Aleutians.<sup>9</sup>

While Aleut-Russian intermarriage was thus a vital social dynamic for the development of proficient native Orthodox leadership, this dynamic occurred rather later. An earlier social dynamic began with the initial contacts. It occurred within the alliances formed between hunters across the Aleutian Islands.<sup>10</sup>

In 1762, Shashuk a toion of Umnak entered into alliance with S. Glotov a Russian Orthodox hunter who had come from northeastern Asia and who remained in the Umnak region from 1758 to 1762. Shashuk entrusted a nephew to him, and the ally baptized the youth. This was the first baptism, or among the first, in the Unalaska region. Names were given and shared: the godson received the baptismal name Ivan and he assumed his godfather's names as his own patronymic and surname; thus the youth Mushkal (Mushkalyax) became the Aleut Ivan Stepanovich Glotov.<sup>11</sup> He remained alongside his godfather for the next three years. Together they departed Umnak aboard the *Sv. Iulian* and traveled to Kamchatka where they stayed from August until 10 October 1762. They then journeyed

<sup>9</sup>Veniaminov's brother Stepan had accompanied him and later became a missionary priest to Chukchs; Veniaminov's son-in-law Petelin became the priest of Nushagak and subsequently of Kodiak, then a missionary priest in northern Asia (Pierce, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 527). See Appendix, Aleut and Creole Churchmen in Alaska: Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, in Oleksa, *Alaska Missionary Spirituality*, pp. 377-86.

<sup>10</sup>For an analysis of types of Aleut-Russian contacts, see Mari Sardy, "Early Contacts between Aleuts and Russians, 1741-1780," *Alaska History* 1, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 1985/86): 43-58. For a summary historical analysis, see Lydia T. Black, "The European Fur Trade, in 'The Nature of Evil: Of Whales and Sea Otters,'" in *Indians, Animals, and the Fur Trade*, ed. Shepard Krech III (Athens, 1981), 117-21; and for a summary description of social interactions, see id., "Russia's American Adventure," *Nature History* (December, 1989) 46-57.

<sup>11</sup>See Pierce, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 169.

aboard the *Sv. Andreian i Natalia* to Kodiak Island where they spent the winter of 1762-63, before returning along the eastern Aleutian Islands to Umnak, Ivan's home island, in spring of 1764.

Eventually succeeding his uncle Shashuk as the primary toion of Umnak, the Aleut Ivan Stepanovich Glotov exercised mature political and spiritual leadership into the next century, including the conducting of Orthodox services in a chapel he himself had had constructed, as reported in 1808.<sup>12</sup>

Another example of this social dynamic is evident concurrently at the other side of the island chain, on the western Aleutians. On Attu in 1761 a toion named Makuzhan had his young kinsman baptized by men who had come there from northeast Asia for the hunt. The toion's young kinsman received the baptismal name Leontii and also assumed his godfather's names as his own patronymic and surname, becoming the Aleut Leontii Vasil'evich Popov.<sup>13</sup>

Entrusted thus to his godfather, he journeyed alongside him, departing that same year on the *Sv. Ioann Ustiuzhskii*, sailing east to the islands of Buldir, Kiska, Segula, Awadax, Little Stikin, and Amchitka; then turning westward to hunt on Shemya (a Near Island) in summer 1763, before continuing to Kamchatka. In September of the following year, the merchant Popov funded the same vessel for a voyage that spent nearly a year on Bering Island before returning to the Near Islands in summer 1765. This would be the voyage that brought Leontii home.<sup>14</sup> By then, he would have had four years in his godfather's company, hunting, exploring, and learning the ways of these men who had come from northeastern Asia.

### *An Indigenous Social Process.*

A process occurred in these parallel, concurrent examples that corresponded to an indigenous social process guiding the successions of toions. Three key elements were involved. Firstly, succession occurred among "customary lineage chiefs" on the eastern Aleutians, and within a "hereditary kin group" on the central and western

<sup>12</sup>*Voyage of Gideon*, p. 122.

<sup>13</sup>Stepan Cherepanov, 3 August 1762, in *Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom okeane i Severnoi Amerike v XVIII veka*, ed. A. I. Andreev (Moscow, 1948), 117-18.

<sup>14</sup>For these voyages, see Lydia T. Black, *Atka: An Ethnohistory of the Western Aleutians* (Kingston, Ont., 1984), pp. 67, 83; see also Raisa V. Makarova, *Russians on the Pacific, 1743-1799*, trans. R. A. Pierce and A. S. Donnelly (Kingston, Ont., 1975), pp. 60-61, 63.

Aleutians.<sup>15</sup> Hence in the examples, on the eastern Islands the Aleut Ivan Stepanovich Glotov succeeded his own uncle Shashuk as toion of Umnak. A further example derives before 1786 when the Aleut Sergei Dmitrievich Pan'kov succeeded his own brother as toion.<sup>16</sup> The successor's names clearly indicate baptism, for Sergei is a baptismal name, and also indicate an alliance with the Russian Dmitrii Pan'kov who had made a number of voyages into this region and had evidently entered into a number of lasting alliances.<sup>17</sup>

The second component in the social process was the fostering of children. Parents permitted their children to be raised by kinsmen or even by non-consanguine affines:<sup>18</sup> the latter would be friends and allies. Hence the young men were entrusted to their godfathers by elder kinsmen. The Aleut Ivan Stepanovich Glotov's godfather and the Aleut Leontii Vasil'evich Popov's godfather clearly honored the trust by returning the youngsters to their elders after years of traveling, exploring, and hunting.

Succession depended also on skill and on valor. A successor was expected to have distinguished himself by mastering techniques of seafaring and of hunting. He was expected also to have completed expeditions to foreign lands and thus to have gained experience of wider geography and of other peoples.<sup>19</sup> This was the third component.

In each example the godson went to Kamchatka. What would he have seen? By the early 1740s, the Kamchadals were Eastern Orthodox; churches (with priests) or chapels (without priests) existed in the major settlements where Kamchadal men exercised leadership.<sup>20</sup> The

<sup>15</sup>Veniaminov, *Notes*, p. 244; Iakov Netsvetov, "Atkha Aleuts," in Veniaminov, *Notes* p. 370. For the toions' patriarchal, or conciliar, manner of leadership, see Veniaminov, *Notes*, p. 241; Netsvetov, "Atkha Aleuts," p. 370.

Aleutian Island societies comprised several regional groups. See map, *Unangam Ungiikangin kayux Tunusangin . . .*, comp. Waldemar Jochelson, ed. Knut Bergsland and Moses L. Dirks (Fairbanks, 1990), p. xviii; cf., Lydia T. Black, *Early History*, in "The Aleutians," *Alaska Geographic Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1980) 83 (reprinted, id., *Atka*, x). For analyses see: Black, *Atka*, pp. 41-71; id., "Early History," pp. 82-84; Knut Bergsland, Introduction to *Unangam Ungiikangin*, pp. 2-5.

<sup>16</sup>Black, *Atka*, pp. 94, 187-88.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. pp. 83-84; id., "Ivan Pan'kov — An Architect of Aleut Literacy," *Arctic Anthropology* 14, no. 1 (1977) 99.

<sup>18</sup>Netsvetov, "Atkha Aleuts," p. 369; Veniaminov, *Notes*, p. 191.

<sup>19</sup>See Veniaminov, *Notes*, pp. 184, 191, 206, 229.

<sup>20</sup>Stepan P. Krasheninnikov, *The History of Kamtschatka and the Kurilski Islands*,

first clergy had been assigned in 1705, from Tobolsk.<sup>21</sup> A priest was described at Petropavlosk in 1779, an embarkation site for the Aleutians since 1741: the "benevolent and hospitable pastor" was "native on his mother's side."<sup>22</sup>

The Kamchadals themselves comprised up to 50 per cent of the men who came to the Aleutians for the sea hunts during the initial contact period, between 1745 and the 1760s. Later during the 1770s when the purpose of enterprises and the nature of contacts changed, the percentage of Kamchadals involved decreased.<sup>23</sup>

---

trans. James Grieve (1764; reprint, Surrey, 1973), pp. 180, 205, 263-67. See also James King, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean . . . performed under Captains Cook . . .* [et al.] in the years 1776 . . . [to] 1780 (London, 1784), 3, pp. 303-04, 367, 368. See also *Voyage of Gideon*, pp. 124-26. Cf. Krasheninnikov with Gideon: the former's contemporary observation in the early 1840s, deriving from successive years there, reports four churches/chapels at that time; while the latter's retrospective history, deriving from a brief tour, reports two churches/chapels from the 1740s and others from the 1760s to 1790s. Regarding the Kamchadals' religiosity, the three unrelated sources are unanimous, from the early 1740s, 1779, and 1808 respectively.

<sup>21</sup>Josef Glazik, *Die Russisch-orthodoxe Heidensmission seit Peter dem Grossen* (Munster, 1954), p. 92; Eugene Smirnov, *A Short Account of . . . Russian Orthodox Missions* (London, 1903), p. 12.

<sup>22</sup>King, *Voyage under Cook*, 368; see also J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *Journals of Captain James Cook*, Hakluyt Society (Cambridge, 1967), p. 1253.

<sup>23</sup>Black, *Atka*, p. 77; id., "Early History," p. 92. Other Russians during the initial contact period were mainly from Siberian towns and from the White Sea region (id., *Atka*, p. 77). The latter would include, as well as the northernmost Slavs, the Komi, the Karelians, and the eastern Sami (eastern Lapps). These Finnic-speaking peoples are related to the Ugric-speaking Mansi and Khants of Siberia. The eastern Sami were Eastern Orthodox from the 16th century; the Mansi and Khants, from approximately the same time; the Komi, from the 14th century at the latest; and the Karelians, beginning as early as the 10th. Their Russian-ness may be found in their Eastern Orthodoxy (ritual life and worldview), in their shared Eurasian language, Russian, and in their social alliances.

References to cultural and physical affinities are noted below. For affinities between Russians and Itelmens (Kamchadals) at Kamchatka in 1779 and the early 1740s, see: King, *Voyage under Cook*, 189-219 passim; Krasheninnikov, *History of Kamtschatka*, pp. 191, 195, 218. For affinities between the Russian Orthodox Kamchadals and the Aleuts at Unalaska in 1778, see John Ledyard, *A Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage* (1783; Cornell, 1963), p. 95; note that the "Indians" are Kamchadals and Aleuts, indistinguishable from each other in the text until Ledyard lists some of their vocabulary. For affinities between the Russians and the Alaskans in the Kodiak and Chugach regions in 1794, see George Vancouver, *Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean and Round the World* (1798; Amsterdam, N. Israel) 3, pp. 122, 200.

Contrast these north Eurasian Russians who came for the sea hunts beginning in 1745 with the Westernized entrepreneurs and administrators who followed in the

*The Merging of Faith and Polity: The Exercise of Leadership by the Aleut Orthodox, 1780s-1790s.*

The following is a chronological summary of protests against an influx of enterprises and imperial interests into the Unalaska region during the later 1700s. Before June 1787, a toion's kinsman named Izosim Polutov dispatched a written protest from the central Aleutian Islands to the Okhotsk district commander.<sup>24</sup> At the same time, Tukuran Aiugnin dispatched a report from the "third Fox Island" (an eastern Island: Akutan, possibly Akun, or even Unalaska) also to the Okhotsk office.<sup>25</sup> Before 1791, a toion Algamalinag named Mikhail and bilingual Saguakh named Ivan Chuloshnikov spoke out in person to the naval captain G. Sarychev who had anchored at Unalaska, whose expedition for the government had been charged in part to collect such testimony.<sup>26</sup> In 1796, toion Ivan Stepanovich Glotov of Unmak led twenty-two other toions of his region in a protest directed to the imperial capital Petersburg.<sup>27</sup> In 1797, a toion Yelisei Popachev traveled with the Aleuts Nikolai Lukanin and Nikifor Svin'in and with the missionary hieromonk Makarii toward Petersburg.<sup>28</sup>

---

1770s, particularly from 1784. Contrast, e.g., the descriptions by Vancouver (cited above) with the portraits of Grigorii Shelikhov (in Pierce, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 556; also in Grigorii I. Shelikhov, *A Voyage to America, 1783-1786* (Kingston, Ont., 1981), pp. 58-59. For an interpretation quite possibly applicable to this contrast and therefore to Aleutian and southern Alaskan history, see Pierre Pascal, *The Religion of the Russian People*, trans. Rowan Williams (London and Oxford, 1976), p. 3: "a single nation with two totally different peoples," see also, Nicholas Zernov, *The Russians and Their Church*, 3rd ed. (London, 1978), pp. 106, 123: "The unity of Russia during the Moscow period (before c. 1725) was neither national nor political: it depended mainly on the knowledge of 'obriad' (ritual life). . . . The new Empire and Capital (Petersburg) were foreign plants in Russian soil."

<sup>24</sup>G. Kozlov-Ugrenin, 15 June 1787, Okhotsk, in P.A. Tikhmenev, *A History of the Russian-American Company*, vol. 2: *Documents*, trans. Dmitri Krenov, eds. Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly (Kingston, Ont. 1979), p. 16. See also, R.G. Liapunova, "Relations with the Natives of Russian America," in *Russia's American Colony*, ed. S. Frederick Starr (Durham, 1987), p. 116.

<sup>25</sup>Ugrenin in Tikhmenev, *Documents*, p. 16; Liapunova, "Relations," p. 116.

<sup>26</sup>Natives of the Unalaska district to government inspectors, 1789-1790, Appendix 6 to Shelikhov, *Voyage to America*, p. 128. For this task given to the Billings/Sarychev expedition, see Liapunova, "Relations," pp. 117-18.

<sup>27</sup>Liapunova, "Relations," p. 124.

<sup>28</sup>Makarii to Synod, 5 October 1797, trans. Lydia T. Black, in Oleksa, *Alaska Missionary Spirituality*, p. 290.

The key to the chronology consists in the men's names. Only one lacked a baptismal name. Eastern Orthodox leaders were in place, stood firmly, and acted on behalf of their people through the influx.

An extended example is found in the toion Sergei Dmitrievich Pan'kov. By 1791, he had visited Kamchatka and had made at least two journeys to Okhotsk,<sup>29</sup> whence in response to protests received, official communications had been dispatched that clearly articulated the Aleutian Island peoples' civil rights as Russian subjects.<sup>30</sup> In that year of 1791, this toion had traveled to Unimak Island (in the Unalaska region) where he consulted with kinsmen. Then he journeyed to Unalaska to meet with naval captain Sarychev governmental expedition was charged, in part, to investigate. Pan'kov came with twenty-five Aleut men: fourteen with him in a baidarkas (an umiak), another eleven alongside in single-hatch baidarkas (kayaks).<sup>31</sup> At the meeting, other toions were present as well, among whom Pan'kov presided. Addressing Sarychev in Russian, this primary toion wore a headcovering and a over-garment of light red cloth and of velvet with gold or golden trim, presented to him by a government office in northeastern Asia. Outstanding in colour, unusual in texture, they distinguished him from the other toions in the council and from Sarychev: for the clothing was unlike a European uniform. Dressed as an Aleut of high status, the primary toion stood and spoke.

Through leadership such as this, the Aleuts maintained remarkable autonomy on the Aleutian Islands and achieved an unusual degree of independence. As observed by Vaniaminov in the 1830s, they were more independent than the Kamchadals (who likewise had come under Russian-American Company rule) and were freer even than baptized Asians (who had not): "in their own locale, the Aleuty are more independent and free than the people of Kamchatka and even baptized Asians."<sup>32</sup> Autonomy was reflected in the moral qualities described

<sup>29</sup>Black, *Atka*, p. 94.

<sup>30</sup>Ugrenin in Tikhmenev, *Documents*, pp. 15-16; Liapunova, "Relations," p. 116.

<sup>31</sup>Black, *Atka*, p. 95.

<sup>32</sup>"The Condition of the Orthodox Church in Russian America: Innokentii Veniaminov's History of the Russian Church in Alaska," trans. and eds. Robert Nicholas and Robert Croskey, *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 63 2 (April, 1972) 47. Veniaminov's primary knowledge was of the Unalaska district (eastern Aleutian Islands). For autonomy in the Atka district (central and western Aleutians), see *Journals of Netsvetov: Atka Years*, 12; for specifically Atka Island and Amchitka Island (central Aleutians), see respectively, *ibid.* pp. 18-19, 30; and for specifically the Near Islands (western Aleutians), with adaptation to a commercial economy, see Appendix.



for them consistently by Veniaminov;<sup>33</sup> it was reflected as well in their intellectual pursuits in their own language, evident in these journals and also in the work of subsequent generations on the Islands. With autonomy and with the language, the culture prevailed.<sup>34</sup> The leadership was successful.

These leaders were empowered legally and morally: legally through information received from northeast Asia where an articulated prerequisite for trade on the islands was humane conduct; and morally through the ethics intrinsic in Orthodox Christianity. Especially those leaders who had succeeded their kinsmen as toions through indigenous social processes of upbringing and succession,<sup>35</sup> would have known themselves to be empowered in these ways, by having traveled to Kamchatka and moreover having had Christianity imparted to them through alliances with men like themselves. They exercised this power.

Their leadership on behalf of polity was a continuation of leadership in the previous generation. Earlier in the mid-1760s, toions in the Unalaska region had created a militant alliance to counter the escalating influx. The alliance was formed by polities on major islands in the Unalaska region (later the parish): it was led by the polities of the islands of Tigalda and Akun and included Unimak, Unalaska, and Umnak.<sup>36</sup> The successors continued, employing new tactics now, including reports directly to Petersburg and petitions for the governmental enforcement of legality.

When one reads of the Russian Orthodox Church defending native people during this time of trouble, one should therefore recognize the Aleut Orthodox toions in the Unalaska region. They were already leading when they were joined by the missionary hieromonk Makarii. While thus widened, the perception would also be refined: for Makarii was reprimanded by authorities in the imperial city for his unauthorized activity.

---

1, "Notes on the Western Aleutians and the Commander Islands by Navigator Vasil'ev (1811-1812)," in Black, *Atka*, 151-70 passim, esp. pp. 160-61.

<sup>33</sup>Veniaminov, "Conditions," pp. 505-52; id., *Notes*, pp. 166-88, 319-20, 323. But not for company dependents at Sitka: id., "Conditions," 47.

<sup>34</sup>See *Unangam Ungiikangin*, photographs as well as various texts. See also the artifact collections from the Aleutians e.g.: under Etholen and Wrangell 1820s-1830s; by Voznesenskii, 1840s; by Pinart, 1870-1872.

<sup>35</sup>See above.

<sup>36</sup>Black, "Ivan Pan'kov," 97; Pierce, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 391.

Who was Makarii? A hieromonk (monastic-priest) from the Konevskii monastery in Karelia, he was a member of the spiritual mission to Kodiak Island, that initially consisted of ten monastics. Arriving at Kodiak in September 1794, he was dispatched with an interpreter to the Unalaska region in summer 1795, where he traveled to a very few islands, including Unga and Akun, on the route to the harbor settlement at Unalaska Island. Remaining in the latter vicinity, he joined Aleut toions against the escalating commercial and imperialist enterprises of the Shelikhov-Golikov Company; and the following June, with six Aleut men he journeyed towards Petersburg, carrying a petition of protest from regional toions.

The dimensions of the task become clear when one considers the purpose and circumstances of the journey: they were traveling to protest against a commercial power which had representatives in the towns of Okhotsk and Irkutsk and which was gaining monopolistic economic and administrative control over the entire northeast Asian coast, the North Pacific archipelagos, and the southern Alaskan coast. The men had to arrange transportation through those regions and had to travel through those towns which were coming increasingly under company control. Makarii himself was a monastic without title, and he would have had few if any sources of financial support. Furthermore he lacked authority to travel: he had departed without authorization. He journeyed resourcefully and (one may well imagine) cleverly. Of the original group of seven men, three survived to arrive at Petersburg in spring 1798: hieromonk Makarii, Nikolai Lukanin and Nikifor Svinin were granted their audience with the Emperor. Makarii was reprimanded for unauthorized activity. Intercessions by the Aleut men spared him from punishment.<sup>37</sup> On their return journey eastward, all three died: Lukanin and Svin'in on the overland route across Siberia; Makarii on the sea crossing, off the Aleutians, towards Kodiak. This was the only Russian missionary to the eastern Aleutians: the conscientious and resourceful Makarii who gave his life with these Aleut leaders.

Russian Orthodoxy thus merged with the people's own leadership, with their own struggle, with their destiny. This merging of faith and polity is reflected particularly in a person who recurs in Veniaminov's journals: Ivan Pan'kov the toion of the islands of Tigalda and Akun. The same islands had provided the leadership for the Aleut

<sup>37</sup>Instruction, Kodiak Office to V. P. Petrov, 12 Oct. 1802, in Tikhmenev, *Documents*, p. 133.

wars in Pan'kov's grandparents' generation during the mid-1760s; and in his parents' generation in 1791, the toion Sergei Dmitreivich who presided at the council at Unalaska had had the same surname.<sup>38</sup> Yet, prior to Veniaminov's arrival, Ivan Pan'kov was providing religious instruction within his polity himself.<sup>39</sup> When Veniaminov arrived, Pan'kov donated money for the reception and settlement of the priest and family: indeed he donated more than the average sum.<sup>40</sup> Elder in age to the priest, Pan'kov accompanied Veniaminov on pastoral visits to Tigalda and Akun where the priest was warmly received.<sup>41</sup> This toion co-translated the catechism and the Gospel; and after Veniaminov's transfer, Pan'kov had chapels constructed in 1842 and 1843 on both those islands for his own people.<sup>42</sup>

An earlier example of the merging of faith and polity is provided by Ivan Stepanovich Glotov the Aleut toion of Umnak. It was he who had led twenty-two men of the Unalaska region in a protest written directly to the imperial capital in 1796. Yet when hieromonk Gideon landed briefly at Unalaska in 1807, the same toion came to receive an anointing from him.<sup>43</sup> This same toion constructed a chapel for his polity (Recheshnoe in the journals; today's Nikolski). Baptized in 1762 through his uncle's alliance, journeying to northeast Asia, having become literate and bilingual, he also became proficient in Orthodox rubrics: in his mature years this same toion was conducting daily services in that chapel himself.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, "he may have substantially assisted in spreading Christianity among the Aleuts."<sup>45</sup>

### *Conclusion*

How had the Unalaska parish come into being? It was a develop-

<sup>38</sup>For possible kinship between these toions, see Lydia T. Black, "Epilogue to 'Ivan Pan'kov: an Architect of Aleut Literacy,'" *Orthodox Alaska* 7 4 (October, 1978) 32-33.

<sup>39</sup>Veniaminov, *Journals*, comment, 24 April 1828.

<sup>40</sup>Black, "Ivan Pan'kov," 97.

<sup>41</sup>Veniaminov, *Journals*, 13 April and 24 April 1828, 16 September 1829. In 1824, Pan'kov was forty-six years old (Black, "Ivan Pan'kov," 96), Veniaminov was twenty-seven years old (b. 1797).

<sup>42</sup>Black, "Epilogue," 29-32; id., "Ivan Pan'kov," p. 98; Pierce, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 392.

<sup>43</sup>*Voyage of Gideon*, p. 142.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. p. 122.

<sup>45</sup>Veniaminov, *Notes*, p. 233.

ment by the people beginning three generations prior to Veniaminov's arrival through social dynamics such as alliances and later intermarriages with northeast Asians and northern Eurasians. Orthodoxy was thus engrafted from like to like within hunting cultures indigenous to the far north.

Thus when Veniaminov arrived, the Aleuts were already Eastern Orthodox; and he had been assigned as their parish priest. He ministered within an existing parish with people whom he described as "exemplary Christians."<sup>46</sup>

In this context, Veniaminov's ministry can be described as cooperative leadership. It is recorded in his journals; and the journals are therefore a source both for this man and for these people.

### *A Question*

While clarifying Veniaminov's ministry, the context also stimulates a question. Aleut faith and polity had merged during the preceding generations when Russian Orthodox toions led their people against and through an influx that was tantamount to a tacit invasion. What was Veniaminov's own retrospective view of the influx?

He was ministering and writing in the aftermath of assaults on the eastern Aleutian and Kodiak Island archipelagos by the Shelikhov enterprises. On the eastern Aleutians Islands, a Shelikhov enterprise had been either named or implicated in each of the protests by the Russian Orthodox toions during the 1780s and 1790s.<sup>47</sup> However in 1799 by imperial decree, the major interests in those enterprises were granted a renewable charter for monopoly rights in the region. Within a year, they had erected a monument lauding the company's progenitor Grigorii Shelikhov, who had died in 1795, and by extension thus lauding the company themselves, for, among other achievements, "emplanting the Orthodox faith" in (what came to known as) Alaska.<sup>48</sup> The Russian-American Company continued to usurp this credit for themselves while seeking periodic renewals of their charter from the government; an example is a history they commissioned.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup>Veniaminov, *Notes*, p. 229; id., "Conditions," 51. See also note 36 above.

<sup>47</sup>See notes 37-41 above: where a Shelikhov enterprise is not named, cf. the location with the enterprise(s) operative at that place at that time.

<sup>48</sup>Appendix 8, Inscriptions for the monument to Grigorii Shelikhov, in Shelikhov, *Voyage to America*, p. 136.

<sup>49</sup>P. A. Tikhmenev, *A History of the Russian-American Company*, trans. and ed. Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly (Seattle and London, 1978), pp. 15-16, 35-36.

Veniaminov had been raised and schooled in the shadow of such a monument erected in 1800 by imperial decree on cathedral grounds at Irkutsk.<sup>50</sup> He attended the Irkutsk Theological Seminary (seminaries and ecclesiarchy in the Petersburg Empire were supervised by the imperial government),<sup>51</sup> where it seems he assimilated the euphemisms that had rendered the invasion a "colonization," the advance an "advancement."

He criticized the methods of change, or the lack of methods. In this sense he was very insightful.<sup>52</sup> But was he insightful with regard to the euphemisms? Did he criticize the undercurrents that were causing the change?

The question is partly rhetorical; for when he arrived in 1824, Aleutian Island leadership and Aleut culture had proved largely resilient, having weathered the earlier flux of commercial and imperial interests; and a relative social equilibrium had settled. He was not confronted with the intense crisis which had faced Makarii in 1795/96.

Yet the question persists, and it asks as the hegemony and culture of a people are being threatened. Are the undercurrents of the "advance" being accepted by non-native clergy in the field and by ecclesiarchy in the political capital; if so, then whose interests are being served?

<sup>50</sup>Appendix 9, Extract from Iurii Radchenko, in Shelikhov, *Voyage to America*, pp. 143-44.

<sup>51</sup>Based on an ecclesiology from, e.g., England. See Gregory L. Freeze, Introduction, *I.S. Belliustin: Description of the Clergy in Rural Russia* (Ithaca and London, 1985), p. 17.

<sup>52</sup>Veniaminov, Glance at the Aleut's Present Enlightenment, in *Notes*, pp. 317-23.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

---

DEMETRIOS TRAKATELLIS: Being Transformed:  
Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans

ARISTEIDES PAPADAKIS: Byzantine Perceptions  
of the Latin West

PETER L'HUILLIER: The Development of the Con-  
cept of an Ecumenical Council (4th-8th Centuries)

VIGEN GUROIAN: "Cleansers of the Whole Earth"  
The Ecological Spirituality of the Armenian Church

IAIN TORRANCE: Paradigm Change in Christology:  
Gregory the Theologian—Severos of Antioch

CASIMIR MCCAMBLEY: Against Those Who Prac-  
tice Usury by Gregory of Nyssa

CLIVE FOSS: Cities and Villages of Lycia in the Life  
of Saint Nicholas of Holy Zion

JOHN CHRYSOAVGIS: Love and Sexuality in the  
Image of Divine Love

STANLEY S. HAKAKAS: Must God Remain Greek?  
Orthodox Reflections on Christian Faith and Culture

---

Volume 36 Numbers 3-4 Fall-Winter 1991





# **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**

---

**Volume 36      Fall-Winter 1991      Numbers 3-4**

**Published by the**

---

***Holy Cross Orthodox Press***

---

**Hellenic College**

---

**Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology**

---

*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December by the Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The GOTR publishes papers and reviews in the fields of Theology, Biblical Studies, Church History, Byzantine History, and related classical, archaeological, and philosophical studies.

Two copies of any article should be submitted and must be in a form suitable for sending to the printer. Footnotes (as well as the text) should be double-spaced and placed at the end of the manuscript. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and a return envelope with postage is included. The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

Articles submitted should be addressed to the Editor, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A. Books for review should also be addressed to the Editor.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the *Review* are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the editors, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology/Hellenic College, or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The GOTR offers the following subscriptions: Regular — \$22.00; Outside U. S. A. — \$25.00; Sustaining — \$50.00; Life — \$500.00.

Requests for subscriptions, back issues and advertising should be addressed to Mr. Constantine Moralis, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A.

All available issues, Vols. 1-20 (1954-1975), prepaid \$40.00; individual issues, \$3.00; double issues, \$5.00. Vols. 21-23, \$10.00 each; individual issues, \$3.00. Vols. 24-28, \$13.00 each; individual numbers \$4.00. Vols. 29-30, \$14.00; individual numbers, \$4.00. Vols. 31-33, \$16.00 each; individual issues \$5.00. Vols. 34-35, \$20.00 each; individual issues \$6.00; 36 — \$25.00 each; individual issues \$7.00. Out-of-print issues available from Xerox University Microfilms, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.



Copyright 1991, Holy Cross Orthodox Press

Published by the *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*  
of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology  
50 Goddard Avenue  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146 U. S. A.

Printed in the United States

*Cover design by MARY C. VAPORIS of Needham, MA*

---

## Editorial Board

---

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Methodios Tournas, *President*  
*Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology*

*Editor*

The Rev. Dr. Nomikos Michael Vaporis

*Associate Editors*

The Rev. Dr. Stanley S. Harakas

The Rev. Dr. Theodore G. Stylianopoulos

*Assistant Editor*

Dr. Sophronia Tomaras

*Book Review Editor*

The Rev. Dr. George C. Papademetriou

*Managing Editor*

Constantine Moralis

**Editorial Board**

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Demetrios Trakatellis	Dr. George S. Bebis
The Rev. Dr. Alkiviadis Calivas	Dr. Lewis J. Patsavos
The Rev. Dr. Emmanuel Clapsis	The Rev. Dr. Thomas FitzGerald
The Rev. Dr. Nicholas Kastanas	Dr. John Chirban
Dr. Evie Zachariades-Holmberg	Dr. George Pilitsis
Dr. Aristotle Michopoulos	Dr. Demetrios Alexandrakis

**Editorial Advisory Board**

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Maximos Aghiorgoussis *Pittsburgh, PA*  
Dr. Costas M. Proussis *Hellenic College*  
Dr. John E. Rexine *Colgate University*  
The Rev. Dr. Demetrios J. Constantelos *Stockton State College*  
Dr. Deno J. Geanakoplos *Yale University*  
Dr. Robert M. Haddad *Smith College*  
Dr. Peter Topping *Dumbarton Oaks*  
Dr. Aristides Papadakis *University of Maryland*  
Dr. Ihor Ševčenko *Harvard University*  
Dr. John A. McGuckin *University of Leeds*  
Dr. Daniel Sahas *University of Waterloo*  
The Rev. Dr. John Chryssavgis *St. Andrew's, Sydney*



---

## Contents

---

### ARTICLES

- Being Transformed: Chrysostom's Exegesis of  
the Epistle to the Romans  
METROPOLITAN DEMETRIOS TRAKATELLIS 211
- Byzantine Perceptions of the Latin West  
ARISTEIDES PAPADAKIS 231
- The Development of the Concept of an  
Ecumenical Council (Fourth-Eighth Centuries)  
ARCHBISHOP PETER L'HUILLIER 243
- "Cleansers of the Whole Earth"  
The Ecological Spirituality of the  
Armenian Church  
VIGEN GUROIAN 263
- Paradigm Change in Sixth-Century  
Christology: The Contribution of Gregory  
the Theologian to the Christology of  
Severos of Antioch  
IAIN TORRANCE 277
- Against Those Who Practice  
Usury by Gregory of Nyssa  
CASIMIR MCCAMBLEY 287
- Cities and Villages of Lycia in the  
Life of Saint Nicholas of Holy Zion  
CLIVE FOSS 303
- Love and Sexuality in the Image  
of Divine Love  
JOHN CHRYSSAVGIS 341

Must God Remain Greek? Orthodox  
Reflections on Christian Faith  
and Culture  
STANLEY S. HARAKAS

353

## REVIEWS

Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Βυζαντινή Κληρονομία — Θεολογία, Ιστορία, Παιδεία* [Byzantine Heritage: Theology, History, Education].  
(JOHN E. REXINE)

361

Deno J. Geanakoplos, *A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (330-1990): "First Among Equals" in the Eastern Orthodox Church.*  
(JOHN E. REXINE)

363

Methodios G. Fouyas, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀντιπαράθεσις Ἑλλήνων καὶ Λατίνων . . . 858-1439* [The Ecclesiastical Diversification of the Greeks and the Latins . . . 858-1439].  
(DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS)

365

John McGuckin, *Saint Gregory Nazianzen: Selected Poems.*  
(GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU)

367

Elizabeth Behr-Sigel, *The Ministry of Women in the Church.*  
(ELAINE GOUNARIS HANNA)

368

Justo L. Gonzalez, *Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance, and Use of Money.*  
(JEFFREY GROS)

371

Kenneth Cragg and R. Marston Speight 3rd, *The House of Islam.*  
(GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU)

372

Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787).*  
(GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU)

374

## BOOK NOTES

Paul Nicholas Chryssikos, *Recital of the Most Holy Proussiotissa and the Sacred Monastery of Tatarna*; Ruy O. Costa, *One Faith, Many Cultures: Inculturation, Indigenization, and Contextualization*; Joseph Mitsuo, *The Quest for Human Unity: A Religious History*; Gerard S. Sloyan, *Jesus: Redeemer and Divine Word*; Charalambos P. Hatzopoulos, *Τὸ ἱερὸ μυστήριον τοῦ γάμου· οἱ μικτοὶ γάμοι*; Stylianos Papadopoulos, *Θεολογία καὶ γλῶσσα· ἐμπειρική θεολογία-συμβατική γλῶσσα*; John Pawlikowski, *Jesus and the Theology of Israel*; Paul M. Van Buren, *The Change in the Church's Understanding of the Jewish People*; Francis X. Murphy, *Patristic Heritage in the Renaissance and the Modern World*; Stuart E. Brown, *Meeting in Faith: Twenty Years of Christian-Muslim Conversations Sponsored by the World Council of Churches*; WCC, *The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People. Statements by the World Council of Churches and Its Member Churches*; WCC, *Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation: Insights from Orthodoxy*; Gennadios Limouris, *Icons: Windows in Eternity: Theology and Spirituality in Color*; Martin E. Manty, *We Might Know What to Do and How to Do It: On the Usefulness of the Religious Past*; Lorus H. Feldman, *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*; Ioannes Papadopoulos, *Ἡ Βλαχέρνα*; Bonnie Bouman Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church*.

(GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU)

377

## CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Dr. John Chryssavgis is a member of the Faculty, St. Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College, Sydney, Australia.

The Rev. Dr. Demetrios J. Constantelos is Charles Cooper Townsend Sr. Distinguished Professor of History and Religion, Stockton State College.

Dr. Clive Foss is Professor of History, University of Massachusetts, Boston.

Brother Jeffrey Gros is Associate Director, Ecumenical Affairs, National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Dr. Vigen Guroian is Professor of Theology, Loyola College, Baltimore.

Ms. Elaine Gounaris Hanna is a graduate of Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The Rev. Dr. Stanley S. Harakas is Archbishop Iakovos Professor of Orthodox Theology, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The Most Rev. Dr. Peter L'Huillier is Archbishop of New York and New Jersey (OCA).

Brother Casimir McCambley is a member of the monastic community of St. Joseph's Abbey, Spencer, Massachusetts.

Dr. Aristeides Papadakis is Professor of History, University of Maryland.

Dr. John E. Rexine is Emeritus Professor of the Classics, Colgate University.

Dr. Iain Torrance is Professor of Theology, University of Birmingham, England.

The Most Rev. Dr. Metropolitan Demetrios Trakatellis is Distinguished Professor of Biblical Studies and Christian Origins, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.









---

## Love and Sexuality in the Image of Divine Love

---

JOHN CHRYSSAVGIS

SEXUAL LOVE HAS A GREAT MULTITUDE OF FACETS, IMPLYING MANY experiences, attitudes, relations. I shall not analyze such known, distinctive notions as affection (*storge*), friendship (*philia*), charity (*agape*), and *eros* which tend to be taken as isolated, ready-made notions. My purpose is to focus on love as a pervasive vital force in human nature.<sup>1</sup>

### *The Divine Origin of Love*

Christianity affirms that love constitutes man's inner being. The trinitarian God is a God of personal relations. When John says that "God is love" (1 Jn 4.8, 16), love is assumed to be an ontological reality inherent in both God and man, who is created in the likeness of God. The beauty and freedom of the human person, Nicholas Berdyaev observes, is God himself. Some nineteenth century poets, for instance Browning, speak of love as identical with sanctification. God himself is our archetype of love. It is he, "the creator of all . . . who out of extreme erotic love moves outside himself . . . (and approaches humanity), burning with great goodness and love and *eros*."<sup>2</sup> It is he who is "the fullness of erotic love."<sup>3</sup> And it is supreme love that moved God to create man in his image and likeness.<sup>4</sup> "As lover he

---

<sup>1</sup>For a lucid anatomy of love, see C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (Glasgow, 1960).

<sup>2</sup>Dionysios, *De Div. Nom.* 4, 12 PG 3.712AB.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Dionysios, *De Div. Nom.* 4, 12-14 PG 3.709BC and Maximos, *Comm. in Div. Nom.* 4, 17 PG 4.269CD.

<sup>4</sup>Maximos, *Comm. in Div. Nom.* PG 4.261B.

creates; and as loved he attracts all towards him.”<sup>5</sup> “As a mad lover he desires his beloved human soul,” says Nilos.<sup>6</sup> “Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us” (1 Jn 4.10).

Human love, just as man himself, as woman herself, can be a glorious image of divine love. Nothing less than that, but also not more. The Christian way of life is marked by a striking paradox: God approaches one when one is least like God. Humility enables one to love. In recognizing one’s limitations one is able to transcend them. “Etiam peccata,” says Augustine: through our sins, more precisely through our frailty, we are led to perfection. We are cleansed through fire (Ps 65.12). Weakness, infirmity, imperfection drive us to God, who himself wants “all mankind to be saved” (1 Tim 2.4). “The mercy of the Lord runneth after us all the days of our lives” (Ps 22.6), “for his mercy endureth for ever” (Ps 135). Hence, very early in its existence the Church had to decide whether it was to be, here on earth, a community for imperfect, yet complete, indivisible, human beings or a kind of museum of truncated, stunted religionists. It did not choose the latter.

Unfortunately a great deal of our discourse on sexual love is tainted not so much by wrong ideas (and practices) as by a dissociation of sensibility, a dissection of life, where physical activity is detached from the life of the spirit, or the life of the spirit is detached from bodily experience. Hence *eros* appears as a debased form of love, if not as its direct opposite. Yet loving desire is a latent spiritual energy, an inherent God-given force, rooted in divine life itself. To come to terms with sexuality is largely a matter of recognizing that it is bound by God to the deepest and most creative aspects of human nature.

### *Love As Eros*

*Eros* or sexuality today has become a mere diversion in life, determined by sensual appetite. When one is hungry one eats; when one feels a sexual urge one acts as one pleases. But this leads merely to the trivialization of sex, and trivial sex serves to dehumanize personality. The exercise of sexual powers involves our whole personality, rather than being a mere function of the biological organism. It also

---

<sup>5</sup>Maximos, *De Amb.* PG 91.1260. Cf. also Dionysios, *De Div. Nom.* 4, 10.

<sup>6</sup>PG 79.464.

involves the personality of another human being. Love implies openness to the other. We are all in need of others, whether physically, emotionally, or intellectually. We need them if we are to do anything—even in order to be born. We need them if we are to know anything—even ourselves. No human being is an island: “for it is not good for man to be alone” (Gen 2.18). It is this which gives a sense of freedom in sexual experience, of divine spontaneity and delight in the other, even though it may also contain possibilities of damage and destruction.

Theologians often express the fear that love of this kind leads to idolatry or self indulgence, or both. This fear may account for the moralism and legalism of much theological discourse on sex, and indeed for the excessively solemn and unctuous tone of it. The real danger however is not so much that lovers might idolize each other but that they might idolize love itself rather than the loved one, and erect a self-sufficient system of its own, a fetishism. True, there is a lure to idolize another person, too, if that other person (a spouse, a parent, a friend) turns into a substitute of God, a self-sufficient “rival” to God (Lk 14.26). Yet the real nature of love is to move beyond oneself, and in a way beyond the beloved person. Dionysios the Areopagite, writing in the fifth century, employs the word “eros” to describe this movement, because it denotes the element of “ecstasy,” of self-transcendence: “ec-static.”<sup>7</sup> Dionysios evidently tries to stave off possible objections to the idea of *eros* among the moralists of his own time. But he insists on it. Later on, Maximos the Confessor depicts the whole universe as erotically responding to God, engaged in a ceaseless erotic dialogue with him.

It is significant that the scriptural understanding of history is of a dynamic realization of a love relationship: the “chosen people” of God in the Old Testament was his bride, whether faithful or unfaithful through time. Similarly, love, *eros* is an index of knowledge. To know is not merely to register items of information, but to participate in, to share personally, to open up lovingly to, the object of knowledge. It is in this sense that Saint Paul speaks of divine knowledge as a “person to person” experience (1 Cor 13.12), in which one “knows God, or rather is known by God” (Gal 4.9).

Speaking of human love, one must recognize that life is full of

---

<sup>7</sup>*De Div. Nom.* 4, 12 PG 3.709B.

people who are deeply wounded in an infinite variety of ways, including the ways of love, and of sexual love. We do not know whether the wounds and the damage could always have been avoided. The only means of not being taken in by any gamble over the issue for a Christian is to preserve his (her) fidelity to the vision of men and women true to themselves in their wholeness and freedom. They are not likely to do so by way of so-called "return to nature," whether in the Rousseauesque sense or in the form of contemporary sexual "liberation." They will regain true nature and be liberated if they accept a view of sex as a way of transfiguration, as a love which is more powerful than death (S of S 8.6), affirming as it does to the limit the life of the lover and the beloved in their supreme inter-relation.

It cannot be stressed too much that the omission of the sense of person-to-person relationship in the love between man and woman leads to a defective understanding of it, and indeed to its undoing. With the disappearance of the sense of the real personality and the needs of the partner, he (she) turns into an object, and hence a victim. As already noted, love is not mere gratification of hunger. It is above all a self-giving. It is also a sacrifice, whose archetype is Golgotha, involving losing one's life in order to gain it. Love as mere lust, as appropriation and exploitation, creates a gulf between man and woman and leaves one deeply alone. This "exploitative" tendency in love accounts greatly for the degradation of woman, not only in connection with the economic acquisitiveness which plagues our society but also in the ecclesiastical milieu. Even Saint Paul, no doubt for different reasons, clearly had a poor view of women, or, for that matter, of marriage—as an alternative to "burning." The same applies in a measure to monastic circles (more about monasticism; see below). Yet none other than Paul himself speaks of the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit, insisting that the body, no less than the mind and soul belong finally to God and find their fulfilment in him.

In the last analysis it is the Church which served to unlock the meaning of sexuality by declaring marriage to be a sacrament. But well before the "sacrament" was adopted as an ordinancy by the Christian Church, in preliterate societies and in ancient Greece, in the ancient Near East and the Indo-Iranian world, material means were viewed as channels of spiritual power. In particular nuptial intercourse was given a sacred, mysterious significance, indicating spiritual potency transmitted through sexuality. It could be a sinister

and ominous force, or, as in the Christian sacrament, an event imparting saving grace and a pledge of a covenant relationship with the sacred order. Later, Augustinian theology which was dominant in the West, first linked original sin with human sexuality, implying, as in Neoplatonism, that man's return to God must be through escape from the human body.<sup>8</sup> The underlying mind-body dichotomy, which on the whole was quite alien to the Eastern Patristic tradition, had a particularly damaging effect on human relations where sex was concerned, turning sex into a legitimate mechanism for the continuation of the human race. Admittedly, Aquinas and earlier medieval theologians, such as William of Thierry, acknowledge the significance of friendship—in marriage or otherwise—as a spiritualized form of love, but there is no recognition of the intrinsic sacramental nature of sexual relationship. Later—Theresa of Avila and John of the Cross are cases in point—there is a great deal of sublimated sex, but it strikes one as an exercise, at times a heroic exercise, in intensified disembodiment. In the Renaissance, the “rediscovery of the body,” paradoxically combined with a cult of virginity, did not fundamentally change the trend towards the dematerialization of sex, while carnal desire became objectivised to the point of losing all contact with human reality.

Nowadays, there is of course no lack of sex. But by and large the more sex, the less passion; or, rather, the more multiple sex is, the less there is belief in its power. Given the state of society, some such equation is perhaps irresistible. The gods have been isolated, displayed, advertised, examined, analyzed, deposed. The old fear or the old wonder has given way to disbelief—a sort of erotic atheism, rational, invulnerable, and more than a little smug. The suggestion that sex could matter, distresses; that it could enchant, spellbind, wound, sear, perhaps even destroy—apalls. Love, communion, consummation, soul, for God's sake? What lamentable naivete about human motivation! Meanwhile, sex, together with all other human relations, becomes empty. To fill the vacuum is to recover the ultimate, “sacramental” ground of love in self-giving; to exploit is to withhold. So far Freud was right, when he claimed that evil consists in refusing

---

<sup>8</sup>Cf. D. S. Bailey, *The Man-Woman Relationship in Christian Thought* (London, 1959) and P. Sherrard, *Christianity and Eros* (London, 1976). Augustine and Aquinas go as far as to state that woman was created solely for purposes of procreation.



to give through fear of masquerading as morality, or other respectable disguise. Many Christians use their Christianity for this purpose. What however eluded Freud (or for that matter Nietzsche in a similar context) was the basis of Christ's quarrel with the Pharisees. The Pharisee is a pious fraud, upright perhaps, conscientious and God-fearing, but making himself good by using God and using other people as allies for the self, which maintains and increases a division of personality and generates the illusion that he is whole and has no need of the physician. Christ pricked the bubble of this pretension.

### *The Approach of the Church Fathers*

Sexuality cannot be reduced to intercourse, or to procreation, or to concupiscence: in any case, for the Christian concupiscence involves what has been committed "in the heart." The heart in the scriptural and Patristic sense includes not only the sensations, but also feelings and affections. It is an all-embracing notion, virtually synonymous with the human person, and hence includes the body. The Eastern Fathers at the very beginning can be described as "materialist."<sup>9</sup> They spoke, as already noted, of human personality as an integrated whole, which includes bodily manifestations. According to Patristic theology, there occurred a breach in man's natural state: this is known as the fall into corruption and death. The fall is "unnatural," contrary to God's design about nature. To endorse the existing condition of human life as natural is to ascribe to God the responsibility for the evil and sins in the world. The difficult problem of theodicy cannot be discussed here. What is important in the present context is to affirm that what God created is essentially "good": "and God saw that it was good" (Gen 1.13). So is sex. We shall never gain any understanding of the ethical problems involved if we treat sex as a detachable entity which can be dealt with on its own. I have already referred to Saint Paul's view in the matter, as well as to the attitude of the Church. The Church appears austere in regard to sex. It certainly repudiates casual sex, promiscuity. This cannot be otherwise so long as the Church holds to its view of the ultimate value and wholeness of persons, of sex founded on deep personal relations. But it is not concerned principally with negative prohibitions. It does not impose chains and fetters. It seeks to protect

---

<sup>9</sup>Cf., for example, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh* by Tertullian.

human freedom. This is why the Christian East never made celibacy obligatory for the priesthood: it eschewed a eunuchised priesthood. Significantly the Scriptures, in representing the love between God and man, almost entirely ignore angelic imagery and go straight for the images of real, tangible love, speaking of bride and bridegroom, of marriage, of union and communion. The same symbolism is stamped on participants in the Eucharist, in which divine activity is communicated to the body of Christ in Christian worship, as they identify themselves afresh with Christ: "Thou hast smitten me with yearning, O Christ, and with thy divine love hast thou changed me; but do thou burn away with thy spiritual fire my sins."

For the Fathers of the Church, life is inherently, intrinsically, and intensely communal, inter-personal, eucharistic. "From our neighbor is life and from our neighbor is death," states Anthony of Egypt (215-356).<sup>10</sup> For some the "other" is a real or a potential threat: "l'enfer c'est l'autre" (Sartre). For the Christian "l'autre" is a "neighbor," an *alter ego*, a beloved. Loving means caring; loving means trust and dependence, meeting and encounter, respect and knowledge. Loving means humility which puts the lover beneath all creatures (see Rom 9.3), in contradistinction to the superior "philosophical" love which looks down condolently on others, or even to the "humanitarian" altruistic love which regards others as equals, at most.

### *The Sacrament of Marriage*

Marriage must surely be more than a social or even an ecclesiastical institution concerned with the welfare of a family, and with its survival and continuation in a divided world. Love can never be exclusive; it is by its very nature all-inclusive. The bourgeois conception of the family as a tightly-knit, self-contained unit hardly differs from self-absorbed individualism, except that it broadens the range.

And the Church does not idealize the family. It tends to use it as an image, a type. Through it the Church Fathers perceived a dynamic element in the family, leading to freedom, to love, to eucharistic communion. For the Church, what is important is not

---

<sup>10</sup>*The Sayings of the Desert Fathers* (Alphabetical Collection) Anthony 9. Cf. also, for example, Basil the Great, *Longer Rules* iii, 1: "For nothing is so characteristic of our nature as to communicate with one another, and to need one another, and to love our own kind." Cf. also *Macarian Homilies* 37, 3.

whether this or that couple are quarreling or not, or are in each other's arms, but whether they are capable of living a eucharistic relationship, which provides the prototype for marriage as a sacrament. Thus sexual love is dealt with on a level different from that normally considered.

This does not imply the dualistic notion that the essence of marriage is a quasimetaphysical entity, constituted by the sacrament, which endures quite independently of the actual quality of the personal relationship, or any indication that it may for all practical purposes be non-existent. The reality is affected by the existential facts; marriage is not indelible, regardless. But in giving marriage the status of a mystery, a sacrament, the Church shows it as a way of life and love, as a God-given reality, mediating the meeting between the eternal and the temporal. What concerns the Church is nothing less than salvation, the sanctification of every person, every relationship, everything—to the last speck of dust. This is why even our food and drink is transmuted into the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

It is questionable how many today really understand this kind of language about marriage or believe that, as the saying goes, "marriages are made in heaven." In a consumer society it is natural for marriage to become a matter of mutual consumption. In fact, it is surprising that marriage still exercises so much fascination, despite "pre-marital sex," despite trial marriages, despite marriages of wholesale and retail convenience. But marriage can and must be defended on other grounds—"situationally, not prescriptively" (in the words of an American moralist), in terms of the fact that persons matter, that love matters, that the deepest welfare of particular persons in the particular situation of marriage matters, rather than any legal codes, conveniences and appetites. This is the reality underlying the comparison of the union in marriage to the communion between Christ and the Church (Eph 5.32), and providing marriage with the quality of a mystery, a sacrament.

### *The Sacrament of Monasticism*

Love is never satisfied; it can only be fulfilled. This fulfilment is to be found in the act of giving, not in covetousness. In this sense monasticism can be seen as correlative to marriage: it, too, is a way of fulfilment in love, even if monastic chastity may have contributed to the devaluation of marriage in expectation of the *parousia* or the

second coming of Christ. According to Gregory of Nyssa, divine love cannot be achieved without chastity.<sup>11</sup> What is at issue however is not just abstention from sex, not extinction of what, after all, is the most vital response to life, but a redirection to its origin, to its divine sources. This may not be easily grasped, except by the diminishing religious remnant; but at least it can be approached with a degree of respect as a unique and chosen way of life, just as one would expect the sacred and intimate relations between lovers to be respected.

Personal love pervades the experience of true monasticism: "A true monk," says John Klimakos (of the Ladder) (seventh century), "weeps for the sins of each of his brethren, and rejoices over the progress of each."<sup>12</sup> Human beings are seen as essentially members of one another. Created in the image of the Holy Trinity, the human person becomes truly personal in relation to others. This perception is as true of the monk or nun as it is of a married person. The element of withdrawal in monasticism, ostensibly negative, is no abdication of social responsibility. As a matter of historical fact, monks have even acquired, at different times and in various places, a predominant, even privileged role in the exercise of temporal as well as spiritual power. Basically, however, monasticism, just as marriage, is a sacrament of love, directed towards the fulfilment of the Gospel commandment to love God and one's neighbor.<sup>13</sup> Love is greater than any ascetic feat; it is even greater than prayer.<sup>14</sup> A single vivid experience of *eros* would advance one further in spiritual life, would be more effective, than the most arduous struggle against the passions and the severest ascetic methods. Indeed the purpose of all ascetic endeavor is said to be love.<sup>15</sup> A single flame of love burning in the world is sufficient to spark off a cosmic fire. One person burning with love in the world can bring about the reconciliation with God (Gen 18).<sup>16</sup>

It is not surprising that so much struggle, even suffering, goes

---

<sup>11</sup>Gregory of Nyssa composed an entire treatise *On Virginity* as the first step in one's return to the unfallen condition.

<sup>12</sup>*Ladder of Divine Ascent* 4 PG 88.705A. Cf. also Athanasios, *Life of Anthony* 2 and Pachomios, *First Greek Life* 4-5.

<sup>13</sup>Basil the Great, *Letter* 207, 2.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. John of the Ladder, *Ladder* 26:43.

<sup>15</sup>Diadochos, *Gnostic Centuries* 40.

<sup>16</sup>*Saying of the Desert Fathers* 14 PG 65.165.

towards the reclamation and transfiguration of man's sexuality in Christ; it is not surprising that the attempt to realize and redirect the vital, compulsive drives of human nature is attended by many mutilations and distortions. When pleasure (ἡδονή) in spiritual life is diverted, sexuality brings pain in its wake—physical, emotional, and mental pain (δδύνη).<sup>17</sup> This is seen not as "punishment," but as a divine chance, a challenge, even a key moment in the continual struggle on the monk's pathway. The aim, according to some, is dispassion; and according to others, paradoxically, passion. Throughout there is a continuous play on the image of erotic love.<sup>18</sup> They speak of husbands being jealous of their wives, of God's love being greater than the love of a mother for her child, her own flesh.<sup>19</sup> There is an early text (the *Shepherd* of Hermas), where "pleasures are said to be able to save people."<sup>20</sup> In the end, *eros* turns out to be no longer a mere image or symbol but a vital energy, a way, a prototype or mode of existence. Such is the case of John of the Ladder, who speaks of τύπος and ὑπόδειγμα. "As an example of the fear of the Lord, let us take the fear that we feel in the presence of rulers and wild beasts; and as an example (*hypodeigma*) of desire for God, let carnal love serve as a mode (*typos*) for you. There is nothing against taking (*poieisthai imas*) examples of the virtues from what is contrary (*enantion*)."<sup>21</sup> The words "ποιεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς" show that carnal love is not good in itself but must be "made" good; the word "ἐναντίον" shows clearly that for Klimakos there is both contrast and analogy between carnal and divine love. With this qualification, Klimakos' *Ladder* uses the vivid language of lovers: "Blessed is he who has obtained such love and yearning for God as a mad lover has for his beloved."<sup>22</sup>

*Eros*, passionate in its desire (cf. Dan 9.3 and Wis of Sol 8.2), throws light on aberrant (cf. Is 5.4; Jer 2.21) or harmful passions: they are not to be suppressed or silenced but transposed, molded, il-

<sup>17</sup>Maximos, *Ad Thal.* 61 PG 90.628A-629D.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. John of the Ladder, *Ladder* 30:9 PG88.1157, *Mac. Hom.* 9, 9 which speaks of "thirst" and "desire" and Diadochos, *Cent.* 8.

<sup>19</sup>John of the Ladder, *Ladder* 30:5 (1156C) and 11 (1157AC). Cf. also, Dorotheos, *Sayings* 14 (p. 528) and Symeon the New Theologian, *Eth.* 4.

<sup>20</sup>*Pastor, Liber* 3, Sim. 6, Ch. 5.

<sup>21</sup>26:31 (1024BC). Cf. also, C. Yannaras, *Ἡ Μεταφυσική τοῦ Σώματος* (Athens, 1971) pp. 149-66.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. 30:5 (1156C).

lumined, put on their right and natural course. In the monastic context, passions are dealt with differently: they are to be transcended by the conquest of greater and divine passions. The monk makes a leap, turns all his passion towards the Deity (cf. Prov 4.27) and lays all his effort of love at the feet of the Lord: "I have seen hesychasts who insatiably nourished their flaming desire for God through prayer (stillness), generating fire by fire, *eros* by *eros*, desire by desire." In this erotic course, dispassion itself becomes a passion.

Perhaps a world reduced to "flesh" is a small and narrow world by comparison with the world of *such* passion.

### *Epilogue*

With reference to such moral issues, it is not possible to offer simple solutions, answers in the form of objective recipes. Otherwise, one is doing away with the fundamental principle of human freedom. The Church, too, knows of no such recipes. Instead, it recognizes the significance of a spiritual guide who does not so much give orders as remind one of the truth that life is personal. For the Church respects the dignity of the human person even when he falls. Isaac the Syrian persistently asks from God that he be able to recognize and accept the humility (or humiliation) of his nature with pleasure.

Only in the Church is our failure, our sin accepted. One cannot dare to sin in a political party. Yet the Church starts precisely from the reality of sin—the only offering one is really able to make. It is in Christ that death is conquered, that one's individual hell is transformed into heaven, into Church. For hell is abolished in Christ and in love. Whether we enter heaven or hell no longer depends on our merits but on our faith and love.<sup>23</sup> Hell is the absence of personal love: it is, in Dostoyevsky's description, being bound up back-to-back with a person and never being able to encounter his face. Ultimately, the failure to place sexuality in its full sacramental context of a personal relationship, whether in marriage or in celibacy, leads either to its idealization or to its abuse.

Since love is characteristic of human nature as created by God and since man is in a fallen state, love is at once something already granted by God and yet something for which one must strive. It is both a starting-point and an end-point. Whether a monk or a mar-

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Dionysios, *Letter* 8; PG 3.1085.

ried person, one must continually struggle to become what one already is.





---

## Book Notes

---

*Recital of the Most Holy Proussiotissa and the Sacred Monastery of Tatarna.* Greek and English texts. Trans. Paul Nicholas Chryssikos. Thessalonike: "The Velouchi," 1990. Pp. 230, soft.

The present volume contains the Greek text that tells the story of the famous monasteries of Proussos and Tatarna of Evrytania, Greece, as well as an English translation by Professor Paul Chryssikos. These two monasteries were instrumental in transmitting Greek learning and religious education during the dark days of the Turkish occupation.

The book describes the graphic topography, the historical importance of the monasteries, and the treasures that they contain, as well as the folklore of Evrytania.

*One Faith, Many Cultures: Inculturation, Indigenization, and Contextualization.* Edited by Ruy O. Costa, ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988. Pp. 162, soft.

The present volume is a scholarly study on various aspects of the enculturation of faith. The volume is divided into six parts as follows: "Raising the Issues" by Max L. Stackhouse and Jane Cary Peck; "Historical Perspectives" by Francis X. Clooney and Francis Patrick Sullivan; "On Christology" by Lucien Richards and Barbara Darling-Smith; "Faith in the Third World" by Jeanne Gallo and Festus A. Asana; "Faith in the United States, the African American Tradition, and Hispanic Community" by Preston N. Williams, Orlando E. Costas, and Douglas Hall; and "A Prophetic Reconception of God for Our Time" by Talata Reeves.

The book was sponsored by the Boston Theological Institute (BTI) by the BTI executive director, Dr. Ronnie M. Getz.

*The Quest for Human Unity: A Religious History.* By Joseph Mitsuo Kitagawa. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. 289, soft.

This volume, by one of the foremost scholars on the history of religions, is extremely useful for understanding the issues of comparative religions. He examines the vision for human unity in early civilizations from Hebrew, Greco-Roman, and Christian perspectives in the East and the West, including Byzantium, Islam, China, and Japan. He looks at encounters of peoples, civilizations, and religions as well as global synthesis for the unity of humankind.

The volume is a scholarly approach to the phenomenology of religion and to the interreligious and intercultural dialogue, and is well documented with an excellent bibliography.

*Jesus: Redeemer and Divine Word.* By Gerard S. Sloyan. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989. Pp. 160, soft.

This volume is a presentation of the faith in Jesus Christ as redeemer and divine Word. It is well written, up to date, and scholarly. Moreover, it is an excellent presentation of the essential Christian faith for the contemporary generation. Dr. Sloyan answers the questions, "Who do people say Jesus is?" and "Is there a need for a redeemer today?" He discusses the doctrine of redemption in the patristic era, mediaeval debates, the reformation, and the Augustinian crystallization of Western Christology, the Anselmian theory of redemption, a response to Trent, and a usable theology of salvation for our day.

*Τὸ ἱερὸ μυστήριον τοῦ γάμου· οἱ μικτοὶ γάμοι [The Holy Mystery of Marriage and Mixed Marriages].* By Charalambos P. Hatzopoulos. Athens, n.p.: 1990. Pp. 338, soft.

The author discusses the sacrament of marriage from an Orthodox Christian perspective. He gives the background of the institution of marriage in the Greco-Roman world and proceeds to the Christian era. He discusses the characteristics of true marriage, the rite of sacramental marriage, civil marriage, the Christian family, and marriage of the clergy. The last part of the book is devoted to mixed

marriages. He gives the canons governing mixed marriages as well as present practices in the Orthodox Church. He also discusses the particular practices governing mixed marriages in the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, as well as marriages with non-Christians.

He also includes an appendix on the dissolution of marriage and the international law on mixed marriages.

*Θεολογία καὶ γλῶσσα· ἐμπειρική θεολογία-συμβατική γλῶσσα* [*Theology and Language: Empirical Theology — Conventional Language*]. By Stylianos Papadopoulos. Katerine, Greece: Tertios Publications, 1988. Pp. 181, soft.

This book is a discussion about theological discourse. The author emphasizes the semantic and expressive aspect of the language of theology.

As a professor of patristics, the author utilizes the Fathers of the Church to support his views. Professor Papadopoulos sets his task: to provide guidance for the proper use of theological discourse. He advocates recognizing that truth is a living experience in the Church, and that hermeneutics are useful to theologians and the Church in order to interpret the truth. The truth, he emphasized, cannot be understood in terms of linguistic analogy but is experienced.

He rejects both views of the Christianization of Hellenism and the Hellenization of Christianity because truth is beyond linguistic analysis, although it is expressed in conventional language in a variety of ways. Language cannot include the truth in an absolute way because truth is a living and dynamic reality. The words of the Gospel express the truth, and the believer, enlightened through the Holy Spirit, attains faith and experiences through the power of the words of the Lord.

*Jesus and the Theology of Israel*. By John Pawlikowski. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989. Pp. 99.

The author, Fr. John Pawlikowski, is well known for his participation in and publications on the Jewish-Christian dialogues. He is a Roman Catholic professor of social ethics at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago.

The present work is a survey and critical discussion of the various

trends of Jewish-Christian relations. He discusses the twentieth-century development in understanding Jesus' relationship to Judaism, contemporary Christology and Judaism, incarnational Christology, as well as the continuing vitality of Judaism.

The author examines contemporary Protestant and Roman Catholic views regarding the covenant, the fulfillment claims of Christianity, and the validity of the covenant on Mount Sinai God made with the Jewish people.

*The Change in the Church's Understanding of the Jewish People.* By Paul M. Van Buren. Salt Lake City: Westminster College, 1990. Pp. 24, soft.

This small book contains a lecture delivered by Professor Van Buren at Westminster College of Salt Lake City as part of The Westminster I Tanner-McMurrin Lectures on the History and Philosophy of Religion.

Professor Van Buren, a Protestant Episcopal minister who taught for many years at Temple University, has lectured widely and has written a great deal on Jewish-Christian issues.

In the present study he discusses his views on how the Church changed its understanding of Judaism. He approaches the topic from a linguistic analytical methodology. He begins with the early patristic understanding of supercession and develops his thought to the Second Vatican Council and the World Council of Churches that deny that the Jews were rejected or accused by God. Dr. Van Buren's view is well stated as follows, "The key factor will be that by insisting on a leaving of the Jewish story in telling its own, the Church will begin to have to take the Talmud and the Halakhik tradition seriously" (p. 22).

*Patristic Heritage in the Renaissance and the Modern World.* By Francis X. Murphy. Tappan, NY: Shepherd Press, 1990. Pp. 237, soft.

The present volume is a collection of studies by Father Murphy, published as a tribute to him on his seventy-fifth birthday. In it various topics on patristic thought are discussed that exemplify Father Murphy's passion for patristic thought, as well as his wide and deep learning on the Church Fathers, both East and West.

Also included are essays on pastoral, moral, and social issues presented here in the light of Vatican II.

*Meeting in Faith: Twenty Years of Christian-Muslim Conversations Sponsored by the World Council of Churches.* Compiled by Stuart E. Brown. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1989. Pp. 181, soft.

The book is a collection of papers on Christian-Muslim dialogue that were delivered at various meetings of Christians and Muslims from 1969-1989. It is a documentary record of Christian-Muslim dialogue and includes texts that serve as a basis for further exploration of theological and social issues.

*The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People. Statements by the World Council of Churches and its Member Churches.* Geneva: WCC Publications, 1988. Pp. 186, soft.

The present volume contains official statements of the World Council of Churches and member churches on Jews and Judaism. The documents are chronologically placed, beginning with the First Assembly of WCC in Amsterdam, 1948. Also included are statements by individual churches in Europe and America. Commentaries are given on the documents by Allan Brockway, Paul Van Buren, Rolf Rendtorff, and Simon Schoon.

*Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation: Insights from Orthodoxy.* Edited by Gennadios Limouris. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990. Pp. 126, soft.

This volume contains a collection of articles by Orthodox theologians and scholars on justice, peace, and the integrity of creation, given at the meetings held in the USSR and Bulgaria.

The papers include various aspects of the discussion on the topics. Peace and justice are deeply rooted in the incarnate Christ who made peace between God and all beings and the created world.

*Icons: Windows on Eternity. Theology and Spirituality in Color.* Compiled by Gennadios Limouris. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990. Pp. 228, soft.

The present publication is an excellent presentation on the

Orthodox view of icons and piety. The volume was issued as a commemoration of the 1200th anniversary of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787) and contains the history and pronouncements on icon veneration as was affirmed by the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Also included are views on the ecumenicity of the Council by Orthodox, Roman Catholics, and Protestants, as well as views on various aspects of the theology of the icon.

The book is divided into four parts: historical, theological, practical, and experiential.

*We Might Know What to Do and How to Do it: On the Usefulness of the Religious Past.* By Martin E. Marty. Salt Lake City: Westminster College, 1989. Pp. 22, soft.

This brief study is part of a series on history and philosophy at Westminster College in Salt Lake City. The author, a well-known scholar, looks at the role of history in the social activities that shape the religious in the communities.

*Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity.* Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gobei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987. Pp. 448.

The present book contains excellent articles on Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity. Josephus had a great influence on the Church Fathers in Byzantium, the Middle Ages, and the Reformation. It is an invaluable aid for the understanding of the formative centuries of Christianity and Judaism.

*Ἡ Βλαχέρνα [Vlacherna].* By Ioannes Papadopoulos. Katerine, Greece: Tertios Publications, 1989. Pp. 147, soft.

The present volume contains the history, description, and illustrations of the Vlacherna, a suburb of Constantinople. It presents the various churches, shrines, palaces, and the old walls. The book includes numerous pictures of ruins, buildings that still stand, and icons that express the rich history of this suburb of Byzantium. It also includes the patriarchal letter of 1487 that establishes the shrine of the holy water in Vlacherna and a service of blessing and ritual of washing (λούσματος).

*The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church.* By Bonnie Bowman Thurston. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989. Pp. 141, soft.

The status of widows in the ancient world, in the time of the New Testament Church, and in the subsequent period, up to 325 A.D., is examined by the author, who states that the "book begins by giving a sense of the socio-economic position of widows in the biblical world." The volume is well documented with notes and citations of primary and secondary sources.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross











ISSN 0017-3894



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

---

GENNADIOS LIMOURIS: The Understanding of the Church Emerging in the Bilateral Dialogues

S. A. MOUSALIMAS: The Formation of the Unalaska Parish, 1762-1824

BERNARD SCHLAGER: Saints Basil and John Chrysostom in the Education of Children

DANIEL J. SAHAS: Ritual of Conversion from Islam to the Byzantine Church

EFTHALIA MAKRIS WALSH: The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites' *Neon Martyrologion*

---

Volume 36   Number 1   Spring 1991



# **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**

---

**Volume 36**

**Spring 1991**

**Number 1**

**Published by the**

---

***Holy Cross Orthodox Press***

---

**Hellenic College**

---

**Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology**

---



*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December by the Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The GOTR publishes papers and reviews in the fields of Theology, Biblical Studies, Church History, Byzantine History, and related classical, archaeological, and philosophical studies.

Two copies of any article should be submitted and must be in a form suitable for sending to the printer. Footnotes (as well as the text) should be double-spaced and placed at the end of the manuscript. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and a return envelope with postage is included. The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

Articles submitted should be addressed to the Editor, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A. Books for review should also be addressed to the Editor.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the *Review* are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the editors, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology/Hellenic College, or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The GOTR offers the following subscriptions: Regular — \$22.00; Outside U. S. A. — \$25.00; Sustaining — \$50.00; Life — \$500.00.

Requests for subscriptions, back issues and advertising should be addressed to Mr. Constantine Moralis, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A.

All available issues, Vols. 1-20 (1954-1975), prepaid \$40.00; individual issues, \$3.00; double issues, \$5.00. Vols. 21-23, \$10.00 each; individual issues, \$3.00. Vols. 24-28, \$13.00 each; individual numbers \$4.00. Vols. 29-30, \$14.00; individual numbers, \$4.00. Vols. 31-33, \$16.00 each; individual issues \$5.00. Vols. 34-35, \$20.00 each; individual issues \$6.00; 36 — \$25.00 each; individual issues \$7.00. Out-of-print issues available from Xerox University Microfilms, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.



Copyright 1991, Holy Cross Orthodox Press

Published by the *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*  
of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology  
50 Goddard Avenue  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146 U. S. A.

Printed in the United States

*Cover design by MARY C. VAPORIS of Needham, MA*

---

## Editorial Board

---

The Rt. Rev. Methodios Tournas, *President*  
*Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology*

*Editor*

The Rev. Nomikos Michael Vaporis

*Associate Editors*

The Rev. Stanley S. Harakas

The Rev. Theodore G. Stylianopoulos

*Book Review Editor*

The Rev. George C. Papademetriou

*Managing Editor*

Constantine Moralis

### Editorial Board

The Rt. Rev. Demetrios Trakatellis

George S. Bebis

The Rev. Alkiviadis Calivas

Lewis J. Patsavos

The Rev. Emmanuel Clapsis

The Rev. Thomas FitzGerald

The Rev. Nicholas Kastanas

John Chirban

Evie Zachariades-Holmberg

George Pilitsis

Aristotle Michopoulos

Demetrios Alexandrakis

### Editorial Advisory Board

The Rt. Rev. Maximos Aghiorgoussis *Pittsburgh, PA*

Costas M. Proussis *Hellenic College*

John E. Rexine *Colgate University*

The Rev. Demetrios J. Constantelos *Stockton State College*

Deno J. Geanakoplos *Yale University*

Robert M. Haddad *Smith College*

Peter Topping *Dumbarton Oaks*

Aristeides Papadakis *University of Maryland*

Ihor Ševčenko *Harvard University*

John A. McGuckin *University of Leeds*

Daniel Sahas *University of Waterloo*

The Rev. George Dragas *Durham University*

The Rev. John Chryssavgis *St. Andrew's, Sydney*



---

## Contents

---

### ARTICLES

- The Understanding of the Church  
Emerging in the Bilateral Dialogues —  
Coherence or Divergence?  
GENNADIOS LIMOURIS 1
- The Formation of the  
Unalaska Parish, 1762-1824  
S. A. MOUSALIMAS 21
- Saints Basil and John Chrysostom on the  
Education of Christian Children  
BERNARD SCHLAGER 37
- Ritual of Conversion from Islam  
to the Byzantine Church  
DANIEL J. SAHAS 57
- The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites'  
"Neon Martyrologion"  
EFTHALIA MAKRIS WALSH 71

### REVIEWS

- Marios Philippides, *Emperors, Patriarchs and Sultans of  
Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle  
of the Sixteenth Century — Introduction, Translation  
and Commentary.*  
(JOHN E. REXINE) 93
- Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Understanding the Greek  
Orthodox Church: Its Faith, History, and Practice.*  
(JOHN E. REXINE) 95
- St. Ephrem the Syrian, *Hymns on Paradise.*  
(JOHN E. REXINE) 97

**Archimandrite Akakios, *Fasting in the Orthodox Church: Its Theological, Pastoral and Social Implications.***

**(JOHN E. REXINE)**

**99**

**Yiannis E. Meimaris, *Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine and The Monastery of Saint Eythymios the Great at Khan et-Ahmet, in the Wilderness of Judaea.***

**(DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS)**

**101**

## **BOOKS RECEIVED**

**105**

## **CONTRIBUTORS**

**The Rev. Dr. Demetrios J. Constantelos is Charles Cooper Townsend Sr. Distinguished Professor of History and Religion, Stockton State College.**

**The V. Rev. Dr. Gennadios Limouris is Executive Secretary, Commission on Faith and Order, World Council of Churches.**

**S. A. Mousalimas is a graduate of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology and a doctoral candidate at Pembroke College, Oxford University.**

**Dr. John E. Rexine is Charles A. Dana Professor of Classics and Chairman, the Department of the Classics, Colgate University.**

**Dr. Daniel J. Sahas is Associate Professor of Religious Studies, University of Waterloo, Ontario.**

**Bernard Schlager is a Ph.D. candidate, Yale University.**

**Efthalia Makris Walsh is a Ph.D. candidate, Catholic University of America.**











---

## Books Received

---

A Faith and Order Study Document. *Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community*. Faith and Order Paper No. 151. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990. Pp. 91. Soft.

Maureen Aggeler. *Mind Your Metaphors: A Critique of Language in the Bishop's Pastoral Letters on the Role of Women*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991. Pp. 150. \$9.95, soft.

Duane W.-H. Arnold. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. Notre Dame-London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991. Pp. 236. \$24.95, hard.

William A. Barry. *Now Choose Life: Conversation as the Way to Life*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 115. \$5.95, soft.

Gregory Baum. *Compassion and Solidarity: The Church for Others*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 109. \$5.95, soft.

Chorbishop Seely Beggiani. *Introduction to Eastern Christian Spirituality. A Syriac Tradition*. London and Toronto: University of Scranton Press, Associated University Press, 1991. Pp. 124. \$27.50, hard.

Polly Berrien Berends. *Gently Lead: How to Teach Your Children about God while Finding Out for Yourself*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1991. Pp. 172. Hard.

Thomas F. Best (ed.). *Vancouver to Canberra 1983-1990. Report of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches*. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990. Pp. 275. \$18.50, soft.

Bernard J. Cooke. *The Distancing of God: The Ambiguity of Symbol in History and Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. 381. Hard.

Eugene J. Fisher and Leon Klenicki (eds.). *In Our Time: The Flowering of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue*. With an Annotated Bibliography by Eugene J. Fisher. A Stimulus Book. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 161. \$8.95, soft.

David Granfield, *Heightened Consciousness: The Mystical Difference*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991. Pp. 219. \$12.95, soft.

Roger Haight, *Dynamics of Theology*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 274. \$12.95, soft.

Leo Hay, *Eucharist: A Thanksgiving Celebration*. Message of the Sacraments, Volume 3-A. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989. Pp. 159. \$12.95, soft.

Gregory C. Higgins, *Twelve Theological Dilemmas*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991. Pp. 128. \$6.95, soft.

Paul Jersild, *Making Moral Decisions: A Christian Approach to Personal and Social Ethics*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. 128. Soft.

Gennadios Limouris (ed.), *Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation: Insights from Orthodoxy*. Geneva: WCC publications, 1990. Pp. 140. \$9.95, soft.

Mark O'Keefe, *What Are They Saying About Social Sin?* New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 118. \$5.95, soft.

C. G. Patrinelis, *Τό Ἑλληνικό Βιβλίο κατά τήν Τουρκοκρατία (1476-1820)*. Thessalonike: University of Thessalonike, 1989. Pp. 81. Soft.

Omeljan Pritsak and Ihor Ševčenko (eds.) with the assistance of Miroslav Labunka. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. Volume 12/13. 1988/1989: Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*. Cambridge: Ukraine Research Institute, Harvard University, 1990. Pp. 894. Soft.

Stergios N. Sakkos, *Ὁ Πέτρος καί ἡ Πώμη. Α' Ἡ Μαρτυρία τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης*. Thessalonike: n.p., 1989. Pp. 135. Soft.

Stergios N. Sakkos, *Οἱ Ἀνώνυμοι Ἀδελφοί στή Β' Πρὸς Κορινθίους Ἐπιστολή τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου*. Thessalonike: n.p., 1990. Pp. 89. Soft.

Bernard Thorogood, *One Wind, Many Flames: Church Unity and the Diversity of the Churches*. Risk Book Series. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991. Pp. 71. Soft.

Peter J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Assen/Maastricht and Minneapolis: Van Gorcum-Fortress Press, 1990. Pp. 327. Hard.

Léon Tretjakewitsch, *Bishop Michel d'Herbigny, SJ and Russia: A Pre-Ecumenical Approach to Christian Unity*. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1990. Pp. 317. D.M. 86, soft.

Constantine N. Tsirpanlis. *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology*. Theology and Life Series, Volume 30. A Michael Glazier Book. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991. Pp. 277. \$16.95, soft.

Patricia Wittberg. *Creating a Future for Religious Life: A Sociological Perspective*. New York-Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991. Pp. 186. \$9.95, soft.

---

James Steve Counelis. *Higher Learning and Orthodox Christianity*. London and Toronto: University of Seranus Press, 1990. Pp. 235. Hard.











ISSN 0017-3894



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**

---

**Volume 36**

**Summer 1991**

**Number 2**

**Published by the**

---

***Holy Cross Orthodox Press***

---

**Hellenic College**

---

**Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology**

---

*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December by the Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The GOTR publishes papers and reviews in the fields of Theology, Biblical Studies, Church History, Byzantine History, and related classical, archaeological, and philosophical studies.

Two copies of any article should be submitted and must be in a form suitable for sending to the printer. Footnotes (as well as the text) should be double-spaced and placed at the end of the manuscript. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and a return envelope with postage is included. The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

Articles submitted should be addressed to the Editor, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A. Books for review should also be addressed to the Editor.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the *Review* are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the editors, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology/Hellenic College, or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The GOTR offers the following subscriptions: Regular — \$22.00; Outside U. S. A. — \$25.00; Sustaining — \$50.00; Life — \$500.00.

Requests for subscriptions, back issues and advertising should be addressed to Mr. Constantine Moralis, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A.

All available issues, Vols. 1-20 (1954-1975), prepaid \$40.00; individual issues, \$3.00; double issues, \$5.00. Vols. 21-23, \$10.00 each; individual issues, \$3.00. Vols. 24-28, \$13.00 each; individual numbers \$4.00. Vols. 29-30, \$14.00; individual numbers, \$4.00. Vols. 31-33, \$16.00 each; individual issues \$5.00. Vols. 34-35, \$20.00 each; individual issues \$6.00; 36 — \$25.00 each; individual issues \$7.00. Out-of-print issues available from Xerox University Microfilms, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.



Copyright 1991, Holy Cross Orthodox Press

Published by the *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*  
of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology  
50 Goddard Avenue  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146 U. S. A.

Printed in the United States

*Cover design by MARY C. VAPORIS of Needham, MA*

# **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**

---

**Volume 36**

**Summer 1991**

**Number 2**

**Published by the**

---

***Holy Cross Orthodox Press***

---

**Hellenic College**

---

**Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology**

---

*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December by the Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

The GOTR publishes papers and reviews in the fields of Theology, Biblical Studies, Church History, Byzantine History, and related classical, archaeological, and philosophical studies.

Two copies of any article should be submitted and must be in a form suitable for sending to the printer. Footnotes (as well as the text) should be double-spaced and placed at the end of the manuscript. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and a return envelope with postage is included. The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

Articles submitted should be addressed to the Editor, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A. Books for review should also be addressed to the Editor.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the *Review* are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the editors, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology/Hellenic College, or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

The GOTR offers the following subscriptions: Regular — \$22.00; Outside U. S. A. — \$25.00; Sustaining — \$50.00; Life — \$500.00.

Requests for subscriptions, back issues and advertising should be addressed to Mr. Constantine Moralis, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U. S. A.

All available issues, Vols. 1-20 (1954-1975), prepaid \$40.00; individual issues, \$3.00; double issues, \$5.00. Vols. 21-23, \$10.00 each; individual issues, \$3.00. Vols. 24-28, \$13.00 each; individual numbers \$4.00. Vols. 29-30, \$14.00; individual numbers, \$4.00. Vols. 31-33, \$16.00 each; individual issues \$5.00. Vols. 34-35, \$20.00 each; individual issues \$6.00; 36 — \$25.00 each; individual issues \$7.00. Out-of-print issues available from Xerox University Microfilms, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.



Copyright 1991, Holy Cross Orthodox Press

Published by the *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*  
of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology  
50 Goddard Avenue  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146 U. S. A.

Printed in the United States

Cover design by *MARY C. VAPORIS of Needham, MA*

---

## Editorial Board

---

The Rt. Rev. Methodios Tournas, *President*  
*Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology*

*Editor*

The Rev. Nomikos Michael Vaporis

*Associate Editors*

The Rev. Stanley S. Harakas

The Rev. Theodore G. Stylianopoulos

*Book Review Editor*

The Rev. George C. Papademetriou

*Managing Editor*

Constantine Moralis

### Editorial Board

The Rt. Rev. Demetrios Trakatellis

The Rev. Alkiviadis Calivas

The Rev. Emmanuel Clapsis

The Rev. Nicholas Kastanas

Evie Zachariades-Holmberg

Aristotle Michopoulos

George S. Bebis

Lewis J. Patsavos

The Rev. Thomas FitzGerald

John Chirban

George Pilitsis

Demetrios Alexandrakis

### Editorial Advisory Board

The Rt. Rev. Maximos Aghiorgoussis *Pittsburgh, PA*

Costas M. Prousis *Hellenic College*

John E. Rexine *Colgate University*

The Rev. Demetrios J. Constantelos *Stockton State College*

Deno J. Geanakoplos *Yale University*

Robert M. Haddad *Smith College*

Peter Topping *Dumbarton Oaks*

Aristeides Papadakis *University of Maryland*

Ihor Ševčenko *Harvard University*

John A. McGuckin *University of Leeds*

Daniel Sahas *University of Waterloo*

The Rev. George Dragas *Durham University*

The Rev. John Chrysavgis *St. Andrew's, Sydney*





---

## Contents

---

### ARTICLES

- John Chrysostom's Greek Classical Education  
and Its Importance to Us Today  
DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS 109
- Male Domination of Woman in the  
Writings of Saint John Chrysostom  
VALERIE KARRAS 131
- Origen and Mariology  
IGOR GOLDEN 141
- The Account from Old Harbor,  
Regarding the Baptism of  
Kodiak Alutiig (1794-1795)  
S. A. MOUSALIMAS 155
- Toward the Reestablishment of Full  
Communion: The Orthodox-Oriental Orthodox  
Churches  
THOMAS FITZGERALD 169
- Joint Commission of the Theological  
Dialogue Between the Orthodox  
Church and the Oriental Orthodox  
Churches 183

### REVIEWS

- Vincent L. Wimbush (ed.), *Ascetic Behavior in  
Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook.*  
(JOHN E. REXINE) 189
- David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson,  
Wayne A. Meeks (eds.), *Romans and*

**Christians.**

(JOHN E. REXINE) 191

Constantine N. Tsirpanlis, *Introduction  
to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox  
Theology.*

(JOHN E. REXINE) 196

Saint Gregory Palamas, *The One Hundred  
and Fifty Chapters.*

(GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU) 200

Dennis C. Smolarski, *Liturgical  
Literacy: from Anamnesis  
to Worship.*

(STELYIO MUKSURIS) 201

*In Memoriam*: †Remembering Father Nikon D.  
Patrinacos

(DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS) 207-209

**CONTRIBUTORS**

The Rev. Dr. Demetrios J. Constantelos is Charles Cooper Townsend  
Sr. Distinguished Professor of History and Religious Studies,  
Stockton State College.

Igor Golden is a Ph.D. candidate, Fordham University.

Dr. Valerie Karras holds a Th.D. from the University of Thessalonike  
and is a Ph.D. candidate, Catholic University of America.

The Rev. Dr. Thomas Fitzgerald is Professor of Religious Studies  
and History, Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School  
of Theology.

Stelyio Muksuris is a graduate student, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox  
School of Theology.

The Rev. Dr. George C. Papademetriou is Director of the Library  
and Adjunct Associate Professor of Theology, Hellenic College/  
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology.

Dr. John E. Rexine is Charles Dana Professor of the Classics and  
Chairman, Department of the Classics, Colgate University.







---

## Remembering Father Nikon D. Patrinos

---

### DEMETRIOS CONSTANTELOS

**'For none of us liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's (Rom 14.7).**

These words of the Apostle Paul can most fittingly be used as the beginning and the end, the prologue and the epilogue, the life itself and the epitaph of a man's history—that of the Archimandrite Father Nikon Patrinos, as clergyman, educator, and writer.

I first met Father Nikon in 1950. I was a young student at the time and he, an already established psychologist, theologian and priest. Since then my esteem, my respect and love for him grew increasingly deeper. For me Father Nikon was the epitome of the cultivated man, the clergyman who had conscientiously given himself to the Greek Orthodox cause, the psychologist and theologian who brought together faith and knowledge, traditionalism and insight, measure and diversity in the life of the Church, as the Greek Fathers of the Church understood them and Greek Orthodoxy recognized.

Father Nikon was an erudite man, yet humble as a child. His expression and speech had a Doric simplicity, yet his writings were prolific and profound. His life was guided by the Sophoclean dictum:

What can be taught, I learn  
What can be found, I seek  
What I wished to have, I have asked of the Gods.

Straightforward, sincere, a man of integrity, with no pretensions

or affections, Father Nikon inspired immediate respect and trust. He expressed his optimism and hope for the future of the Church in spite of the inconsistencies, hypocrisy, weaknesses and other obstacles that can be found in the organized Church, as he, being so close to it, might have known. At any rate, I personally had never known him wearing masks.

However, as I speak these words about him, I feel that I am violating his last wish, which was that no laudatory speeches be made here, but only a few words be said with simplicity and from the heart. I do hope that he will forgive my digression. I believe that in times such as ours, when physical power is admired and money deified, when our attention is directed by the media, often blatantly, to persons making sensational news rather than real contributions, spiritual men such as Father Nikon should not be allowed to leave us unnoticed. True, a man's biography could better be written not by students, friends, relatives or admirers, but by what has been spoken and written by the man, the spiritual legacy that follows him.

Father Nikon has left behind a rich and varied spiritual legacy. He served the Church and Hellenism at large in varied capacities: as priest and founder of communities; as the dean of the Theological Seminary at Brookline, Mass., who developed the academic standards of the School and had it fully accredited; as editor of periodicals and the founder of *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*; as head of Archdiocesan departments; as academic teacher and author of numerous articles, studies and books. He was a traditionalist, yet an innovator; a visionary, yet a realist. His presence in the life of the Greek Orthodox Church in America was a creative and fruitful one and will remain indelible.

Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.  
Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours;  
and their works do follow them (Rev 14.13).

Father Nikon now lies at rest from all labors and pain, from the tribulations and uncertainties of this life, and has entered eternity. In this world, his works will keep his memory alive; in the one beyond the grave, they will be his advocates in the embrace of the Merciful God.

Is it at all possible to speak of life after death? For all men, but us, the Greek Orthodox in particular, with a historical memory and

spiritual legacy of four thousand years, that which we call death constitutes an episode, a kiss exchanged between time and eternity. Since ancient times our forefathers, who first inquired into the meaning of life, have taught on the constant interchange between life and death, the eternity of the soul as the essence of life. Thales of Miletos gave a theological, though scientifically more contemporary, explanation: "Νοῦν τοῦ κόσμου τόν Θεόν, τό δέ πᾶν ἔμψυχον ἅμα καί δαιμόνων πλήρης." That is, the intellect or mind behind the world is God (John the Evangelist names this the Word) and all things have life, and the world is full of human souls (in the ancient classical tradition human souls were also called demons). Other related concepts of the immortality of the soul were formulated by the great philosophers and scientists of ancient Greece, many of whom stressed the kinship of the soul to deity. Finally, the concept of the immortality of the soul was confirmed by Christ whose teachings constitute the epitome of all that is best in both the Judaeo and Christian heritage. "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die," said Christ (Jn 11.25-26) whom Father Nikon served over half a century.

Therefore, the immortality of our reverend and beloved Father Nikon remains ever the more stronger. He enlightened in so many ways those he served. In his relations with his fellowmen, clergy and lay, superior hierarchs and subordinates, he was truly humane and Christian.

But as the Laconian and laconic that he was, I sense that he would be me to end this short speech. Therefore, I bring it to its conclusion with the words he would like expressed in his behalf: "I ask forgiveness from all, my superiors, subordinates and fellow clergymen and from all those I served in the name of Christ. I want no words of praise, only your prayers. Praise creates jealousy and antagonism and tears people apart. Only forgiveness and prayer can unite and allow love to grow among us."

This, his last expressed wish, speaks of the man's sensitivity and true Christian feelings. May his memory in this world live forever and his eternal life in the heavens be blessed.

August 3, 1989



## NEW FROM HOLY CROSS ORTHODOX PRESS

Metropolitan Demetrios Trakatellis, *The Transcendent God of Egnostos.*

ISBN 0-917651-87-1 (hardcover)      \$27.95.

ISBN 0-917651-89-8 (pbk.)      \$19.95.

George Poulos, *Orthodox Saints. Volume One, January through March.*

ISBN 0-917651-64-2      \$14.95.

*Volume Two, April through June.*

ISBN 0-917651-65-0      \$14.95.

*Volume Three, July through September.*

ISBN 0-917651-66-9      \$14.95.

Theodore Stylianopoulos, *The Good News of Christ.*

ISBN 0-917-654-72-3      \$15.95.

Ioannis K. Kornarakis, *Pastoral Psychology and Inner Conflict.*

ISBN 0-917651-78-2      \$13.95.

Cynthia Stallman-Pacitti, *Cyril of Scythopolis.*

ISBN 0-917653-41-6      \$10.95.

Metropolitan Emilianos Timiades, *What the Orthodox Church Owes to the West.*

ISBN 0-917651-96-0      \$19.95.

John Chirban (ed.), *Healing: Orthodox Christian Perspectives in Medicine, Psychology, and Religion.*

ISBN 0-917651-84-7      \$6.95.

D. J. Constantelos, *Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church: Its Faith, History, and Practice.*

ISBN 0-917653-39-4      \$14.95.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

*The House of Islam.* By Kenneth Cragg and R. Marston Speight. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1988. Pp. 152, soft.

The interest and study of the religious experience of world religions enriches the spiritual growth of contemporary human beings. The goal of the present volume is to articulate that the Islamic religion is a living and dynamic religious orientation of life. The purpose is to explain the doctrines, the ethical norms, and institutional structures of the living faith of Islam. Especially in our day, we in the West are exposed constantly to different religions of the world and, for that reason, must become knowledgeable of the beliefs of other people.

The present book is written by two educators as an introduction to Islam. The authors begin by giving a table of dates with details of the Muslim religion from its origin in A.D. 622. The historical events of Islam are listed according to the Christian and Muslim calendars in order to enable the reader to follow the growth of the Muslim religion.

In the introduction, the authors point out the spiritual and cultural richness of Islam which has a long history of deep faith, tradition, and culture. In recent decades the control of the oil lifeline by the Arabs has made the Westerner feel uneasy towards the Muslims. The long history of animosity between Christianity and Islam inclines the West to see the Muslims in negative terms.

In eight chapters the authors discuss the Islamic faith, history, people, and culture. The book begins with the appropriate discussion of the "Lord of the Worlds," that is, theology as talking about God and God in the human awareness. The founder of Islam, Muhammad, was zealously against idolatry. Allah, God, is one and ultimate reality. However, there are "Ninety-nine Names of God" and "the hundredth name is being hidden." The God of Islam is the sole and absolute ruler of the universe. "Beyond the human realm, God is the Lord of all spheres of His creation" (p. 11). This leads to the fatalistic view of the world. God's "perfect knowledge and his almighty power" (p. 13) precludes any flexibility in the will of God. The human free will has to be accommodated under the divine control.

In the second chapter the book gives the historical events of the origin of Islam and its founder, Muhammad—Apostle of God. It gives the physical and cultural environment of the beginning of Islam and a biography of Muhammad and his place in history. Islam was

founded in Arabia in the seventh century A.D. The Arab people that accepted Islam were made up of tribes and nomads. Muhammad the Apostle of God gave to his people the Qur'an and freed them from idolatry. Following his death a split took place between the Shi'ites, who had an intense devotion to the Prophet's family, and the Sunni's, who emphasized the community of believers as a source of power.

In the third chapter the Qur'an is discussed in its Arabic form, as well as the question of chronology, the finality of Scripture, and exegesis. The Qur'an is the speech of God which is chanted without musical instruments and has no choral praises. "The Book constitutes what may well be called a sacrament of mind and voice, because the believer participates in the power of God's word" (p. 39).

In the fourth chapter the Islamic Law is discussed. The Shari'ah or the "way" is the right path to God. This includes both ritual and ethical acts. "Prayer and fasting, for example, are striking reminders to Muslims that the whole of life is meant to be God-aware, God-responsive, and God-ordained" (p. 43). The proper behavior for Muslims is governed by the Qur'an and the traditional ethics of conduct is both inward and outward. In the fifth chapter the worship of Islam and the Sufi Path is treated. Ritual prayer is important in Islam, though there is no priesthood. The Qur'an requires pilgrimages, especially to the Holy City of Mecca. Also discussed is the mystical school of Sufi which emphasizes the religion of the heart.

In the sixth chapter the doctrine and practice of the Muslim community is discussed. Islamic doctrines make a sufficient use of Plato and Aristotle. Though expansion of Islam involved warfare, it was not gained by mere naked ruthlessness. "The hackneyed thesis that Islam was spread by the sword oversimplifies and distorts the story" (p. 75). The Jews and Christians were tolerated because they are not idolaters but rather the "People of the Book."

In chapter seven the book describes the community and its dominant cities. In describing the cities where Islam ruled, the relations of Muslims with Orthodox Christians is also discussed. Special mention is made of the fall of Constantinople. "Istanbul epitomized the fortunes of Islam" (p. 94). As a Greek Orthodox, I mourn the fall of Constantinople and especially the uprooting of Christianity from Asia Minor. "The mighty Saint Sophia Cathedral of Constantinople, home of Justinian and Saint John Chrysostom, great Christian figures in Byzantium, became the 'Mosque of Islam' in Istanbul . . ." (p. 95).

In chapter eight the question of Islam in modern times is discussed.

The modern category of "citizen" rather than "believer" poses a problem for the unified community of Islam. The national order and authority in Muslim countries in the past was established by Islam; but now, in modern times, the society is pluralistic and sometimes Muslims find themselves to be in the minority. It is significant, however, that "the house of Islam was a political, territorial concept, not a racial one" (p. 216).

The book is a very good introduction to Islam, especially as a university text. It contains a glossary of terms and an index which are helpful to the reader. The presentation is very objective and gives a fair treatment of the faith and practice of the Islamic religion.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

*The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787).* By Leo Donald Davis. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987. Pp. 342.

The present study is written to fill the gap in English of political and theological expression of the seven ecumenical councils.

The author, a Jesuit Catholic theologian, successfully presents the historical, political, and theological story of the seven ecumenical councils. The author recognizes the importance of these councils for the "Orthodox Churches and the main Protestant Churches" and that they "accept only these seven as truly ecumenical expressions of Christian faith . . ." (p. 9). To indicate that "the First Seven Ecumenical Councils" and "only these seven as truly ecumenical," clearly points to the fact that the author is prejudiced on behalf of the Roman West. Also an indication of this is his constant reference to papal authority as dominant over East and West during the period of the Councils. Other than these strong positions, the author presents a good study of the seven ecumenical councils.

He begins with an excellent chapter on the political and cultural background of the birth of Christianity. The implications of the Roman emperors as defenders of the gods and the Greek literary character of the religious beliefs, as well as the rivalry of the mystery religions, made an insurmountable task for Christianity to freely develop and bring to fruition their theological expression.

The author points out that the Christian community was united by Christ and expressed this unity in the person and office of the

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

He notes that Gregory is "a theological standard-bearer" (p. xix) and the "Christian Demosthenes," whose poetry is doctrinal teaching in poetic form.

The selection of poems translated are dogmatic and moral in content and expression: "On the Son," "On the Incarnation of Christ," "Hymn to God," "Great Immortal Azouach," "Glory to God the Father," "An Evening Prayer," "A Thanksgiving," "Before Reading the Scriptures, an Epiclesis," "Morning Prayer," "Evening Prayer," "The Serpent," "Lament to Christ," and "Prayer to Christ." In addition, selections from his epigrams are included.

The translation of these poems are in beautiful, practical English that delights the heart and edifies the spirit. In the poem "On the Son," one finds an excellent example of poetic beauty and doctrinal Orthodoxy. It reads:

He was sacrifice and celebrant,  
sacrificial priest and God himself.  
He offered blood to God to cleanse the entire world.  
The Cross lifted him up  
but it was the trap that nailed sin fast.  
And yet how can I speak of all his works?

This book deserves wide reading by all Christians; it will help them in understanding the faith of the early Church and in appreciating the literary, poetic form of one of the greatest men of the fourth century.

I highly recommend this book to clergy and lay people alike; it will inspire, educate, and spiritually edify.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

*The Ministry of Women in the Church.* By Elisabeth Behr-Sigel. Translated by Fr. Steven Biggam. Redondo Beach, CA: Oakwood Publications, 1991. Pp. xiv + 229. Paper.

This translation of Elisabeth Behr-Sigel's essays in *The Ministry of Women in the Church* is an invaluable contribution to the discussion

of women's issues for the English-speaking Orthodox community. Madame Behr-Sigel boldly raises critical issues and questions that are often overlooked, avoided, or discounted.

Her questions are provocative: Does difference between men and women exclude equality or can equals be different? Is the male character of the priest essential to the faith? Does the ordination of women to the priesthood affect the essence of the apostolic faith or is it compatible with ecclesial communion expressed by the patristic saying, "In necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity."? What does the iconic representation of Christ by the priest really mean? Can we say with absolute certainty that God never calls women to the Christian priesthood? Could not the spokesman for the eternal Word, the one who "lends his voice to the Word" be female? Do masculinity and femininity have theological significance?

Mme. Behr-Sigel raises many issues, but consistently comes back to the ordination of women to the priesthood. While the ordination of women deacons is favorably mentioned throughout her essays, her main interest is to determine whether the arguments for or against ordaining women priests are valid and what they imply for the status and ministry of women in the Church. She places this question primarily within the framework of the ecumenical community and devotes great concern to whether or not the Orthodox Church should consider as heretical communities which ordain women.

A drawback to this book is that the essays, written in the late 70s and early 80s, do not necessarily reflect Mme. Behr-Sigel's current thinking nor are they arranged in a chronological order which would trace the evolution of her thought. She clearly states in her introduction that she now questions even further or rejects altogether certain arguments related to the ordination issue: feminine charisms, the priest as the icon of Christ, and the otherness of men and women.

Of feminine charisms, in a chapter written in 1977, Mme. Behr-Sigel said, "The charism that is proper to women, without excluding an aptitude for intellectual activity, is to give life and to care for it (p. 129)." This, she insisted, includes not only biological motherhood, but also the sense, naturally inborn or culturally ingrained, of self-giving to and nurturing of all those in need. Now, however, she maintains that to ascribe certain charisms to women tends to mysticize women and therefore subordinate and assign limited roles to them. I think further study into this issue would reveal a middle ground



which recognizes and fosters feminine charisms without such deleterious effects.

The concept of the priest as icon of Christ, which includes the symbolism of the priest as bridegroom, the husband, of the Church, originally had reasonable appeal for the author. Her current view, however, virtually rejects such symbolism as unnatural. Rather, she deems what the priest *does* to be core to the issue, that he merely lends his voice and hands to Christ, who is the true celebrant of the eucharist. This approach, I believe, has some merit, but tends to be scholastic and fails to see the whole eucharistic/liturgical picture.

Mme. Behr-Sigel discusses in great depth the issue of the otherness of men and women. She vehemently disagrees with the thought that sexuality is grounded in the very being of God, that the vocation of men somehow relates to Christ and that of women to the Holy Spirit, and believes that maleness and femaleness are secondary to humanity. She reasons that to press this concept of the otherness of men and women would make two different kinds of salvation necessary. I think she makes a leap in logic here, but correctly identifies the issues we need to explore.

While some of Mme. Behr-Sigel's conclusions need serious challenging, her emphasis throughout the essays on the ministry of the royal priesthood, the importance of the anthropological and ecclesiological issues, her refutation of the excessive language against women in patristic writing, her insistence on seeking new forms of cooperation between men and women, and her persistence in re-examining the issues regarding the role and ministry of women in the Church are absolutely essential elements of the discussion.

Mme. Behr-Sigel is to be commended highly for raising the issues and working through them so diligently within the context of faith. She tenaciously questions the status quo, the unchallenged traditions, looking for the truth, for the will of God. She asks the questions that shock, even scandalize, but which must be asked and eventually answered. I recommend without reservation the addition of this book to the resources for studying the issue of the ministry and role of women in the Orthodox Church.

*Elaine Gounaris Hanna*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

in a therapeutic sense" (p. 50) — not as in the West, with the idea of mortification of the flesh. Fasting, in ascetic practice, offers the opportunity for restoration of human perfection and is a positive means by which negative human elements are eliminated. Again, the true aim is the restoration of the human being to full communion with God.

Though Father Akakios discusses the relations of the Traditionalist Orthodox to the mainstream Orthodox in Greece and in North America and their competing jurisdictions, especially in terms of the observation of their fasting practices, these pages should be read constructively and in an irenic spirit as suggestions for preserving traditional Orthodox practice.

*Fasting in the Orthodox Church* is a book that should be carefully examined and put to positive use. It is an excellent contribution to a better understanding of a much misunderstood subject.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Sacred Names, Saints, Martyrs and Church Officials in the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine.* By Yiannis E. Meimaris (Athens, 1986). Pp. 292, soft.

*The Monastery of Saint Euthymios the Great at Khan et-Ahmet, in the Wilderness of Judaea.* Idem (Athens, 1989). Pp. 120, soft.

Rare are the scholars so qualified to carry on research and write books like these two under review. Excellently trained in ancient (Greek, Hebrew, Arabic) and modern languages, in paleography, theology, archeology, and philosophy, Dr. Yiannis E. Meimaris has produced first rate scholarship of interest to students of early Christianity, church history, Eastern monasticism, and hagiology. He is a charismatic researcher who has also prepared the Catalogue of the new Arabic manuscripts of Saint Katherine's Monastery of Mount Sinai, discovered in a crypt of the Monastery in 1975.

The first volume under review was published under the aegis of the Research Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, volume two in its *Meletemata* (studies). Based on his doctoral thesis at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the book's purpose is to present the life of the church in Byzantine Palestine as it appears in epigraphical material which has survived

in the form of Greek inscriptions. Chronologically they fall between the fourth and the seventh centuries and they refer to saints, martyrs, church officials, and sacred names. The content of the inscriptions is analyzed in the light of historical and theological literature of the period and of contemporary scholarship.

Though current excavations bring to light new inscriptions, the value of the present volume remains ever useful. The inscriptions in particular clarify obscure accounts and references in theological, historical, literary and legal sources such as the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebios, Sozomenos, and Sokrates, the Acts of Ecumenical Synods, the codes of Theodosios and Justinian, and Lives of Saints. With very few exceptions these inscriptions were written in Greek and are also of linguistic and cultural interest. Furthermore, they enrich our knowledge of Byzantine Palestine's church history, especially the history of the bishopric of Jerusalem and the metropolitan see of Caesarea.

Following an outline of the history of the church in Byzantine Palestine, in part two, the author collects all the inscriptions which use and apply the word *hagios*. The third part provides the history of church administration, the origins and functions of clerical and monastic orders and offices. Part four is devoted to the epigraphical evidence. The epithet *hagios* is used in a number of contexts: seven times to refer to God as Holy Trinity, God (Father), One God, Lord, I Am, Father, Most High, and Almighty. Several sacred names are used for Jesus Christ: Jesus, INBI, Christ, Son, Lord, Savior, God, Lamb of God, and Emmanuel.

The person of the mother of Christ is referred to with a variety of names. Very frequently she is called Hagia Maria. Other names include Theotokos, Parthenos (Virgin), Despoina (Sovereign Lady), Aeiparthenos (Ever-Virgin), Keharitomene (Full of Grace), and Ahrantos (Undefined).

Old and New Testament personalities, confessors, and martyrs are also named in the inscriptions. Of geographical interest is the reference to several holy places including the Church of the Resurrection and the Church of the Ascension. Perhaps more original and of more interest is the number of inscriptions referring to clerical and monastic orders and offices as they relate to the birth, formation, and development of church administration in Palestine.

The inscriptions were executed in wall paintings, graffiti, mosaics, or cut in marble and in local stone and wood. They are transcribed

in their original form in capital letters followed by the author's comments on their condition and meaning. They were found in a large number of sites which apparently were densely populated with both civilian and monastic population and reveal the "astonishing prosperity of Byzantine Palestine."

In his brief but comprehensive epilogue, Dr. Meimaris reminds us that "the majority of the early churches [in Byzantine Palestine] were dedicated to the Virgin Mary" and that the "monks of Palestine made important contributions to the hymnography and liturgy of the church." The nature and the onomatology of the inscriptions reveal "the dominance of Greek Christian culture and of the Greek language in particular during this period in Palestine." Furthermore, "the textual richness of Greek inscriptions" is augmented with "numerous ancient compound and theophoric Greek names," such as Agathonikos, Aiglou, Alexandros, Antiochos, Arion, Genesios, Diodoros, Dionysios, Irenaios, Elladis, Elphidios, Theodosios, Dorotheos, Theophanes, Theophilos, Timotheos, Filetos, and many more.

Anyone writing the history of the Christian movement and Church in the early Byzantine Empire cannot ignore this rich and illuminated research and evidence.

Dr. Meimaris' second volume is a preliminary report of rescue excavations he conducted in the wilderness of Judea between 1976-1979 in search of the monastery of Saint Euthymios the Great as related in the fascinating Kyrillos of Skythopolis, the writer of Palestinian monasticism and the biographer of the saint (A.D. 377-473). The ruins of the monastery were first surveyed by Derwas J. Chitty in 1928-30. The monastery had survived several catastrophes, both human and natural, until "the dreadful persecutions against the Christians of Syria and Palestine during the 14th century" (p. 209) when most probably it was left in permanent ruins — though it is mentioned in several *proskynetaria* (pilgrims' accounts) down to the eighteenth century. The 1928-30 excavations of the ruined monastery remained incomplete. Following the 1967 war between Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, the West Bank of Jordan came under Israeli occupation, including the area of the ruined monastery which was chosen by the Israeli Government for urban development.

Dr. Meimaris conducted his work on behalf of the Israeli Department of Antiquities and Museums and was assisted by students of the École Biblique, the Tantur Ecumenical Institute, the Studium

Biblicum Franciscanum, and several volunteers.

The importance of Dr. Meimaris' excavations lies not only in the completion of Chitty's work but also in the discovery of eight tombs and a refectory of the monastery of a later period. The excavations of 1928-30 and 1976-79 have now identified the cell of the saint, the ground floor of the original house of prayer, a cistern, and a storehouse for wheat. The forty-five page text of the present book is followed by sixty pages of black and white and by seven pages of color figures, including details of mosaics (prothesis, south aisle), color paintings, and fragments of frescoes (of interest to art historians). The identification of the Khan el-Ahmar site with the monastery of Saint Euthymios agrees with the description provided by Kyrillos of Skythopolis.

Dr. Meimaris expects to publish in the future a more complete report of the excavated area which, no doubt, will add to our knowledge of monasticism in Byzantine Palestine. This type of work is extremely difficult and cannot be but the work of love and commitment.

*Demetrios J. Constantelos*  
Stockton College

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

*The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters.* By Saint Gregory Palamas. Trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988. Pp. 288.

The theology of the great fourteenth century Byzantine theologian has in recent years become the object of some research and study among Orthodox and non-Orthodox scholars.

The present study of *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* is a very good additional scholarly presentation. In the introduction the translator provides an excellent analysis of the work. He offers an overview, the general context, and the Orthodox doctrines as presented by Palamas. He also discusses the tradition of the text and the several manuscripts that are still extant. The most important feature of this volume is the critical Greek text and its very competent English translation. In this work, Gregory Palamas manifests a great knowledge of the sciences of his time and an excellent articulation of the Orthodox doctrine against the errors of Barlaam the Calabrian.

Anyone dealing with the thought of Palamas must become familiar with this present work, for it thoroughly discusses the Orthodox faith based on the Church Fathers and the tradition of early Christianity. Palamas goes into great pain to explain the patristic view of the distinction between essence and energies.

The translation overall is quite admirable. However, I would like to point out that the term οὐσία should not be translated as substance. Throughout the text Sinkewicz translates the term οὐσία as "substance." The scholastic term "substance" has a long philosophical tradition in the West that does not apply to Eastern Orthodox theology, especially that of Palamas. To my knowledge all the Orthodox theologians translate οὐσία as "essence" and this is done intentionally. John Romanides very aptly states that, "in both the Capadocian and Alexandrian traditions the οὐσία of God is beyond all categories . . ." And that, "the term οὐσία is used not in the Greek philosophical sense of the definable and knowable immutable inner reality of a thing, but as concrete unknowable reality known only in its acts" (*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10, [1964-1965] 103). So the term οὐσία is not the Augustinian-Thomistic substantial being but rather the "essence" of the mystery of God which is beyond all categories and knowledge.

On page 249 the word "ἁδιαφορος" is translated as "indistinct" which may falsely imply the essence is identified with the energy.



The translation of “οὐκ ἀδιάφορος” should be as “not unlike” to show that the energy proceeds from the essence and both are uncreated.

The present volume of the thought of Saint Gregory Palamas makes it available to a large audience in the Western world. We are therefore in Professor Sinkweicz’s debt for this significant contribution to the better understanding of the thought of a great theologian of considerable stature and influence on Orthodox theology.

*George C. Papademetriou*  
Hellenic College/Holy Cross

*Liturgical Literacy: from Anamnesis to Worship.* By Dennis C. Smolarski, S. J. Mahway, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990. Pp. 216. \$10.95, soft.

In today’s world, effective communication often paves the way for a proper understanding of other people, their ideas and thoughts, their beliefs, and their condition within a given context. Refusal to communicate with others may make an individual socially mute, dumb, and unrelational—closed off, as it were, from new ideas and from communally sharing those ideas. *To not be able* to communicate is one thing; *to not want* to relate with others though provokes a self-alienation which may ultimately lead to a fatal separation from God, from the rest of humanity, and from oneself. Humankind, created in God’s own “image and likeness” (Gen 1.26), was bestowed the gift of intelligible language, the means by which one relates to both the Lord and other human beings.

When one common language is spoken and understood by persons belonging to various groups—social, political, or religious—there may be agreement on certain issues raised in discussion. Needless to say, there may also continue to be disagreement, confusion, and uncertainty between group members. However, in speaking a common tongue, people learn about each other and “grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ” (2 Pt 3.18). They grow in love and respect for one another. Although this mutual understanding between persons may not always be enough to resolve differences of opinion and belief in today’s pluralistic, secular society, speaking a common language certainly creates a firm basis upon which to build towards a possible unity between the

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## The Understanding of the Church Emerging in the Bilateral Dialogues—Coherence or Divergence?

---

GENNADIOS LIMOURIS

IN THE NASCENT THEOLOGICAL TRIALOGUE BETWEEN THE GREAT historic tradition of Christendom, Orthodoxy has assured its due place. Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—first in confrontation and during these past decades in conversation—have been occupying the centre of the stage. The result of the millennial separation between Eastern and Western Christianity has been a spiritual impoverishment whose crippling effects are only now beginning to be surmised. The Western partners became increasingly aware that they cannot proceed much further without the third partner. It is therefore of momentous significance that the Orthodox churches have in recent years become actively engaged not only in the ecumenical movement at large, but also in the expanding bilateral theological conversations with other churches and confessions.

Following a customary definition of the term “bilateral”—as the Orthodox understand and use it—to denote theological conversations sponsored, directly or indirectly by two churches, traditions or confessional families, with purposes ranging from promoting mutual understanding to achieving full communion in true faith and love, and reconciling hostilities and divisions of the past.

It hardly needs to be emphasized that these dialogues, as they are presented in the ecumenical spectrum, manifest considerable pluralism of discussions, agreements, or disagreements on joint statements on converging issues. This variety of course, is inevitable due

\*This paper was given at the Fifth International Forum on Bilateral Conversations, WCC/Faith and Order, Budapest, Hungary.

to the fact that each dialogue has its own history, character, thematology, structure of decision-making, and finally they are at different stages in the ongoing process on the goal and vision of unity and union among churches. They have also been increasingly led to bear Christian witness, and an atmosphere of mutual appreciation, friendship, and fellowship has already become a reality. But has this development also led to a deeper mutual theological understanding? Have the profound differences between the Orthodox churches and the other churches in bilateral dialogues been theologically clarified? This question is legitimate. At least, at first sight, there is a discrepancy between the degree of theological agreement and the factual fellowship which the different traditions have found in the ecumenical movement.

In this perspective Fr. John Meyendorff, for the second meeting of the Orthodox-Roman Catholic Joint Commission in Munich (1982), has written that “. . .the meeting seems to be an extraordinary event that at a time when the ecumenical movement has become entangled in the ambiguities of secularism and polarization, Orthodox and Roman Catholics had the moral strength to look at the fundamentals of the faith, i.e. the mystery of the Church, the Eucharist and the Holy Trinity, as the only true and real issues of Christian unity . . .”<sup>1</sup>

Today, on the international level, the Orthodox churches are engaged in six bilateral dialogues: they are in conversations with Anglicans, Old Catholics, Roman Catholics, Oriental Orthodox, Lutherans, and Reformed. The Third Pre-Conciliar Pan-Orthodox Conference in 1986 examined and carefully evaluated these dialogues and endorsed their importance, significance, and results towards their pilgrimage on the way to unity in true *faith* and *love*:

The Orthodox Church . . . is fully conscious of its responsibility with respect to the unity of the Christian world. It recognizes the real existence of all Christian churches and confessions. At the same time, it is convinced that all its relations with these churches and confessions must be based upon the clarification, as quickly as possible, of ecclesiological questions and particularly of the common teaching with respect to the

<sup>1</sup>J. Meyendorff, *A Comment on the Munich Document: "The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity,"* Joint Orthodox-Roman Catholic Commission, Munich, June 1982, in: *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 4 (1983) 294-98.

sacraments, grace, priesthood, and apostolic succession. The bilateral theological dialogues currently being conducted by the Orthodox Church are the authoritative expression of this consciousness of Orthodoxy. Of course . . . the Orthodox Church is not unaware of the difficulties attached to such undertakings; it realizes that they are not to be avoided on the road to the common tradition of the early, undivided Church and hopes that the Holy Spirit, who builds the entire body of the Church, will provide for the deficiencies. In this respect . . . the Orthodox Church does not depend only on the human strength of those carrying on the dialogues, but also of the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the grace of the Lord, who prayed "that all may be one" (Jn 17.21).<sup>2</sup>

In addition to these international dialogues, several Orthodox churches are also conducting theological conversations with other churches on the local level or in other countries. Historical and socio-political relations in the past as well as theological factors were the main reasons that such talks were undertaken. Many such meetings have already taken place and considerable results have been achieved. Their aim, in the first place, is to remove misconceptions, to promote mutual acquaintance and rapprochement; they further serve as a preparatory stage for later "dialogues in truth" on the world level, exploring possibilities of fuller communion in faith and sacramental life. They should also be considered "co-partners" and "facilitators" to the international dialogues rather than be seen in isolation and without any relation to them. But these efforts are somehow dispersed and lead, therefore, to less visibility and less public recognition than the official dialogues. However, they reflect a serious involvement on both sides, and we must be grateful for their contribution. As we have seen, the dialogues thus represent widely differing stages of developments.

The question which interests us here is therefore "the understanding of the Church emerging from the bilateral dialogues—coherence and divergence"; it has not yet been discussed explicitly in all the

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Final Texts and Decisions of the Third Pan-Orthodox Pre-Conciliar Conference (28 October—6 November 1986), Section 3: "The relation of the Orthodox Church to the rest of the Christian World," in: *Episkepsis*, 369 (1986), 9 (in Greek/French); see also the English text in: *Diakonia*, 1 (1987) 44.

six dialogues, but it is only referred to some of them (e.g. Anglican, Old Catholic, Roman Catholic). Thus the present dialogical exercise is somewhat limited from the Orthodox point of view. It seems to us that it was preferable and even desirable that our theme should be extended also to the other international dialogues in order to identify either common perspectives, coherence, or divergence on the issue, or at least new ways of reflection and substantial developments. This should rather render a service to the ongoing process of the theological conversations, mainly for those which did not yet reach "the mature steps" to deal directly and explicitly with the doctrine of the Church, the nature of the Church, and ecclesiology in particular.

### *Being in Dialogue—Sharing Truths*

God's creation constitutes a single and whole entity. There is no drastic separation between the visible *Ekklesia* or local community, and the invisible *Ekklesia*, the Church triumphant; both constitute the wholeness of God's creation. God's creation is all-encompassing, and the physical is sometimes linked with the metaphysical. It is for this reason that in Orthodox theology the supernatural aspect of the Church is not treated in isolation from the physical or visible Church; and that the saints, the Fathers, the martyrs, and all those who, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, experienced the illumination, the theosis, are in fact contemporaries. The present incarnates the past and anticipates the future. Their Church is our Church of Jesus Christ, and our Church is in direct historical continuity with their Church. Therefore, "God's revelation in Jesus Christ is realized and actualized in the Church and through the Church as the body of Christ," as Lutherans and Orthodox state.<sup>3</sup> The past lives in the present and will continue as long as human beings live in this world.

History and revelation are mutually determined and conditioned. It is of their historical conscience that the Orthodox appeal to the authority of the Tradition, the mind of the Fathers, the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils, the holiness and the experience of the past. Thus, "the Holy Tradition is the authentic expression of divine revelation in the living experience of the Church, the body of the Word incarnate."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Third Lutheran-Orthodox Joint Commission, *Agreed Statement on the Divine Revelation* (Allentown, USA, 24-30 May 1985), in: *Episkepsis*, 341 (1985) 13 (in Greek/French), original text in English.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Fourth Lutheran-Orthodox Joint Commission, *Agreed Statement on Scripture and Tradition* (Chania, Crete, Greece, 28 May-2 June 1987), in: *Episkepsis*, 381 (1987)

However, in the dialogues with Anglicans, Lutherans, and Old Catholics common agreement can be found in the dogmatic expression which is given on the nature of the Church in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381) and confirmed by the Fourth Ecumenical Council in Chalcedon. In this Creed the confession of faith in the triune God is followed by the confession of faith that the Church is "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic." Looking at this affirmation is the Orthodox-Roman Catholic dialogue. It is implicitly stated (Munich, Bari, Valamo), but somehow it appears as a reference to the issues related to faith and sacraments.

Several of the advanced dialogues have a common beginning in the ecclesiological debates by describing the mystery of the Church in relation to its essence and nature in Christological and trinitarian perspectives. The mystery of the Church, as Anglicans and Orthodox state "cannot be defined or fully described. But the steadfast joy of people who discover new life and salvation in Christ through the Church remind us that the Church itself is a lived experience. The Church is sent into the world as a *sign, instrument, and first-fruits* of the Kingdom of God."<sup>5</sup> Use of the word "mystery" also serves a double purpose: to give the sense of a reality which is greater than anything we might say about it, and to indicate that here is something which is God-given and not just "man-made," something in and through which God is at work and in which human beings are involved.<sup>6</sup> Because by its very nature the Orthodox and the Old Catholics agree that "the Church is intimately related to the mystery of the triune God who reveals himself in Christ and the Holy Spirit (cf. Eph 5.32)."<sup>7</sup> It is, as Saint John Chrysostom confirms, "the treasure house of God's ineffable mysteries."<sup>8</sup>

In the Orthodox-Roman Catholic dialogue some—Orthodox and

---

18-19, para. 3 (Greek/French), original text in English.

<sup>5</sup>Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue. *The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* (from now on henceforth quoted as *Dublin*) (London, 1985), p. 9, para. 3.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. C. Davey, *The Doctrine of the Church in International Bilateral Dialogues*, in: *One in Christ*, 2 (1986) 136.

<sup>7</sup>Old Catholic Orthodox Dialogue, *Agreed Statement on Ecclesiology* (Chambésy, Switzerland, 23-30 August 1977), Section 3/1: "The Nature and Marks of the Church," see English text in: *Growth in Agreement*, ed. H. Meyer & L. Vischer, (New York/Geneva, 1984), p. 401, para. 1.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. St. John Chrysostom *Homily in the 1st letter to the Corinthians*, 16,3, in PG 61. 134.

non-Orthodox — have found it “logically difficult” to follow who claims to be the Church. To be more accurate, the Roman Catholics have declared that “the one true Church of Christ subsists in the Roman Catholic Church”<sup>9</sup> whereas the Orthodox state that they are “the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.”<sup>10</sup> or in the Dublin Statement with the Anglicans they say, “it is the one true Church of Christ, which as his body is not and cannot be divided.”<sup>11</sup> This clearly proves that from the beginning both sides, Roman Catholics and Orthodox, insisted that their dialogue must take place “on equal terms”—and the consequences of such an insistence for both participants are that for those who are “engaged in the dialogue a change in ecclesiology is required.”<sup>12</sup> Encouraging results can be seen in the Munich Statement which begins from the “actual” rather than the “ideal.” “In the New Testament the Church describes a ‘local’ reality. The Church exists in history as local church . . . in a given place.”<sup>13</sup> But it is not just man-made—it is not simply “formed by the persons who come together to establish it. There is ‘Jerusalem from the high,’ which ‘comes down from God,’ a communion-koinonia which establishes the community itself,” so that “the Church comes into being by a free gift, by the act of the new creation.”<sup>14</sup>

Here Roman Catholics and Orthodox make the reality “of communion between God and human beings in fellowship” the basic, God-given experience with the language of ecclesiology describes and of which the local Christian community is an “expression.” For the Church “which is in a given place,” manifests itself when it is assembled.”<sup>15</sup> It is “fully assembled when it celebrates the eucharist”; moreover, in the local church, as it celebrates the eucharist, “a new unity is communicated which overcomes divisions and restores communion in the one Body of Christ, a unity which transcends psycho-

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Vatican II, *Decree de Ecclesia, Lumen Gentium*.

<sup>10</sup>Old Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue, p. 402, para. 8.

<sup>11</sup>Dublin, pp. 10-11, paras 8-9 and p. 45, para. 100 (e).

<sup>12</sup>Cf. C. Davey, *The Doctrine*, p. 138.

<sup>13</sup>First Roman Catholic-Orthodox Joint Commission, *Agreed Statement on The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity (Munich, FRG, 30 June-6 July 1982) (from now on Munich)*, Section 2, para. 1, see English text in: *Information Service* (IS), 49 (1982), p. 109; see also text in Greek/French in: *Episepsis*, 177 (1982).

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.



logical, racial, socio-political, or cultural unity. It is the communion of the Holy Spirit . . .”<sup>16</sup>

Thus the Church which is the body of Christ is to be one, and therefore to manifest a “new unity” of all people. The role of an ecumenical dialogue is precisely to bring into harmony the uniqueness of the various historical configurations in which the churches have developed and not to use this as a means of further division, but for a more real and deeper understanding of the personal God who reveals himself in *time* and *space* for the salvation of all of humanity.

The Dublin Statement clearly points out that the reality of division between Anglicans and Orthodox does not yet allow them to find themselves to be one: “We are disrupted Christian people seeking to restore our unity. Our divisions do not destroy but damage the basic unity we have in Christ, and our disunity impedes our mission to the world as well as our relationships with each other.”<sup>17</sup>

It is important to note the language used above, especially the words “destroy” and “damage.” The use of these terms becomes central, especially in the light of how Anglicans are accustomed to see the divisions existing within the Church; “they do not believe that they alone are the one true Church, but they believe that they belong to it.”<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, the Orthodox “. . . believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ, which as his body is not and cannot be divided.”<sup>19</sup> But at the same time they see the Anglicans “as brothers and sisters who are seeking together with them the union of all Christians in the one Church.”<sup>20</sup> And this difference is reconciled in the evaluation section of the epilogue: “But while we agree in our fundamental understanding of the Church that it is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.”<sup>21</sup>

Another important point can be found in the different accounts given of the sinfulness and division observed in the life of Christian communities. Orthodox say that the human members of the Church on earth are sinful and do not believe that sinfulness should be ascribed to the Church as the body of Christ, indwelt by the Holy

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Dublin, p. 11, para. 9.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 44, para. 96 (a).

Spirit.<sup>22</sup> Anglicans follow St Augustine's doctrine in holding that "immaculate" is a proper epithet of the Church triumphant and of the Church as the body of Christ, but not of the empirical society of believers: "The Church," affirm the Anglicans, "under Christ is the community where God's grace is at work, healing and transforming sinful men and women; and because grace in the church is mediated through those who are themselves undergoing such transformation, the struggle between the grace and sin is to be seen as characteristic of, rather than accidental to, the Church on earth."<sup>23</sup>

The ecclesiological concept of the Church as the household or family of God presupposes that believers accept *love* (agape) or "philanthropia" as a common denominator, freely flowing, expecting nothing in return. It is this type of unmerited philanthropy that made Christianity very attractive among the less fortunate members of the Roman Empire's society. It transformed an anthropocentric and limited humanism into a theocentric and ecumenical philanthropy.

Recognizing its own reality in the light of divine Revelation, the Church very early saw itself above all as that area of Christian humanity within which the Spirit of Christ (cf. Eph 2.8) is recreating the communion—*koinonia*—of humanity with God himself and therefore welding into one *communion* of all peoples, races, cultures, social classes and differences between the sexes.<sup>24</sup> The vision which dominates the Epistle to the Ephesians—undoubtedly the first Christian document to be open to all dimensions of the "catholicity" of salvation—is not merely an afterthought to this wakening of the Church to its own true nature (cf. Eph 2.15-22). On the contrary, it expresses what is its essence: that the unity of the Church "is inseparable from the divine purpose of reuniting humanity—in the blessings of the messianic age—a reunification which is *already* taking shape in the Church."<sup>25</sup> It is easy to see why the Early Church Fathers regarded the eucharistic synaxis—in which men and women of every class, culture and race were henceforth one in the Body of Christ—as both the supreme embodiment of the nature of the Church and the supreme statement of God's design for humanity.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 44-45, para. 96.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., para. 99 (d).

<sup>24</sup>Cf. J.M.R. Tillard, *Koinonia-Sacrament*, in: *One in Christ*, 2 (1986) 107.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. J.M.R. Tillard, *Two Programmes—A Single Task*, in: *Faith and Renewal, Faith and Order Paper No. 131* (Geneva, 1986), pp. 100-10.

In the Roman Catholic-Orthodox dialogue, this concept of the Church as communion-koinonia<sup>26</sup> was taken up from the beginning, strongly emphasized and further developed in the Munich statement (1982)—as well as in the following statements—which refers to Saint Ignatios of Antioch's affirmation: "where Christ is, there is the Catholic Church."<sup>27</sup> This also implies that "catholicity or wholeness is a property of each local church."

However, Roman Catholics and Orthodox, wanting to avoid the danger of mere congregationalism, sometimes associate "eucharistic ecclesiology" with a concept of a koinonia-communion between the local churches as they have indicated in the Munich Statement: "the one and unique Church finds its identity in the koinonia of the churches."<sup>28</sup>

Clearly, at this point, difficulties and potential disagreement might emerge as the discussion proceeds. What are the forms and conditions of the koinonia? Is it an eucharistic reality and/experience? If so, asks Fr. Meyendorff, it would also need an eucharistically responsible ministry. And would that be a conciliar institution or a ministry realized in the function (or person) of a universal primate?<sup>29</sup>

The concept of koinonia-communion implies a relationship between local churches that, according to Roman Catholics and Orthodox, "is constitutive of the Church . . . institutions make it visible and, so to speak, 'historize' it." What is implied here—so it seems—is that the mystery of the Church, while always remaining a mystery, manifests itself in history through institutions that, like all realities of history, are changing.<sup>30</sup>

The basic thesis of a pneumatological Christocentrism is the starting point of overcoming the recent theological neo-scholasticism while looking for exact exclusive statements in the form of definitions. The balance of the incarnate Word of God and the eucharistic mystical experience within the one body, the Ekklesia of God, is the focus of the theology of the Church in a dynamic perspective. The title of the Munich Statement itself reveals this truth: "The mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the light of the mystery of the Holy

<sup>26</sup>See the excellent study on the meaning "Communio-koinonia" in different traditions, ed. by the Institute for Ecumenical Research, Strassbourg, 1990.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. St Ignatios, *To the Smyrneans* 8.

<sup>28</sup>Munich, Section 2, p. 111, para. 2.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Meyendorff, "A Comment," p. 296.

<sup>30</sup>Munich, Section 2, p. 111, para. 2.

Trinity." The Pentecostal event is the fulness of the paschal mystery and inaugurates the eschaton of time and history. Through the Spirit the work of Christ continues in history and Church, but ultimately it points beyond history to the full realization of God's design for his creation. "The Church itself in which God's grace is at work is the sacrament par excellence, the anticipated manifestation of the final realities, the foretaste of God's kingdom, of the glory of the God and Father, of the *eschaton* in history," as the Valamo Statement affirms.<sup>31</sup>

This eschatological perspective challenges Anglican, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic as well as Old Catholic and Oriental Orthodox partners—in common mind—to express the understanding of apostolicity, which does not only refer to what has been received from the past; it also points to what is awaited at the last day. The Apostles are not only the authoritative witnesses to Christ's coming in history; they also are companions of the eschatological Christ enthroned for judgment (cf. Mt 19.28).<sup>32</sup> In this perspective "apostolic succession" means more than a mere historical transmission of power from Christ through the Apostles to bishops in the Church. Ecclesial ministry is apostolic not only "because it is carried out in continuity and in fidelity to what was given by Christ and handed on history by the Apostles,"<sup>33</sup> but also "because the eucharistic assembly at which the minister presides is an anticipation of the final community with Christ."<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup>Fifth Roman Catholic-Orthodox Joint Commission, *Agreed Statement on The Sacrament of Order in the Sacramental Structure of the Church. With Particular Reference to Apostolic Succession for the Sanctification and Unity of the People of God* (Valamo, Finland, 19-27 June 1987) (from now on Valamo), Section 2, see English text in: *IS*, 68 (1988), p. 175, para. 22; see also text in Greek/French in: *Episkepsis*, 404 (1988) 9-18.

<sup>32</sup>cf. *Ibid.*, Section 2, p. 175, para. 19 (English text); cf. also Old Catholic-Orthodox in: *Growth in Agreement*, Section 3/1, pp. 403-04, para. 17: "... The apostolic doctrine preserved by the Church is the inner aspect of its apostolicity. Its other element is the unbroken series and succession of pastors and teachers of the Church, starting from the Apostles, which is the outward mark and also the pledge of the truth of the Church..."; cf. Dublin, pp. 13-14, para. 17: "... The apostolicity is manifested in a particular through the succession of bishops. This succession is a sign of the unbroken continuity of apostolic tradition and life"; cf. Second Orthodox-Oriental Orthodox Joint Commission, *Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations to the Churches* (Chambésy, Switzerland, 23-28 September 1990), p. 5. para. 9 (mimeographed, not yet published).

<sup>33</sup>Valamo, Section 2, p. 175, para. 14.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*

It is precisely in the eucharist that history and eschatology meet, that the work of Christ and the Spirit are actualized, that the "Church manifests its fulness,"<sup>35</sup> that "the role of the bishop and of the priest appears in its full light,"<sup>36</sup> and "finds its accomplishment."<sup>37</sup> Coherence and common agreement exist therefore with the above partners in this issue when they strongly emphasize the centrality and importance of the eucharist for the life of the Church in all its aspects. Here especially we see the convergence of modern Orthodox and Roman Catholic thought. Whether we begin with Orthodox "Eucharistic Ecclesiology" or with Second Vatican's *Lumen Gentium*, the conclusion is the same: The eucharist makes the Church what "it is called to be"<sup>38</sup>; it is both source and criterion for all aspects of the Church's life, including its ministry.

Perhaps the most striking issue developed in all dialogues, and its antecedents, concerns "the close link between the work of Christ and that of the Holy Spirit."<sup>39</sup> Again and again it is cautioned against "seeing the economy of Christ in isolation from the Spirit."<sup>40</sup> With remarkable consistency most of the statements have taken a pneumatologically conditioned Christology as their departure.<sup>41</sup> The Spirit "which eternally proceeds from the Father and reposes on the Son prepared the Christ event and achieved it,"<sup>42</sup> from the incarnation and baptism through the sacrifice of Calvary and glorification.

From this Christology springs a pneumatologically conditioned ecclesiology, for the same Spirit which anointed into Christ's Body, and the same Spirit which empowered the ministry of Christ ensures

<sup>35</sup>Ibid. Section 3, p. 176, para. 34.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. p. 177, para. 41.

<sup>38</sup>Munich, section 1, p. 108, para. 4 (b).

<sup>39</sup>Valamo, "Introduction," p. 174, para. 2.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. para. 3.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. J. Erickson, The International Orthodox-Roman Catholic Commission's Statement on Ordination (Valamo, *Ecumenical Trends*, 18/4 (1989)) 49.

<sup>42</sup>Valamo, Section 4, p. 177, para. 44; cf. also Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue, The Moscow Agreed Statement from now on Moscow, ed. K. Ware & c. Davey (London, 1977), Section 6, "The Filioque Clause," p. 87, para. 19; Growth in Agreement, Section 1/3 "The Holy Trinity," p. 394, para. 14/3; Orthodox-Oriental Orthodox Joint Commission, First Agreed Statement on Christology (Anba Bishoi Monastery, Egypt, 20-24 June 1989), see English text, ed. T. Fitzgerald, in: *Ecumenical Trends* 19/3 (1990), p. 47; see also text in Greek/French, in: *Episkepsis*, 422 (1989), pp. 7-8.

that his unique ministry "remains in action in history" within the Church.<sup>43</sup> In a characteristic formulation Orthodox and Roman Catholics affirm that the newness of the Church's ministry consists in that "Christ, servant of God for humanity, is present through the Spirit in the Church, his body, from which he cannot be separated. For he himself is the first-born among many brothers."<sup>44</sup> Here, as elsewhere, the statement offers a healthy corrective to that one-sided "Christomonism" of which Western Christianity so often—and perhaps rightly so—has been accused. Too often we think of Christ as an isolated individual apart from the humankind which he has come to save. We lose sight of the whole Christ, "caput et corpus," to use the phrase of Saint Augustine. We make a disjunction between Christ and his Church, and as a consequence we tend to make the Church into an autonomous self-sufficient institution. Here a pneumatological corrective is essential for the Church in what it is because the same Spirit which anointed Christ anoints it.

The Church, as a sacramental organism, is a body continually being formed and built up, not simply as institution "established" or "founded" long ago by Christ and then left to its own devices. So its ministry also is not simply a vocation to holiness, a life lived according to the Gospel.<sup>45</sup> It is by necessity charismatic, for without the manifold gifts of the Holy Spirit<sup>46</sup>—and without that personal experience of God which is possible only in the Holy Spirit—the Church with its official ministry would not just become "institution": it would cease to be the Church. As the Munich Statement points out, the Church—and its ministry—"is continually in a state of epiclesis."<sup>47</sup> Therefore, the Eucharist and the Church are the body of the crucified and risen Christ and become the locus of the energies of the Holy Spirit.

This understanding prevents us to see in the economy Christ in isolation from the Spirit. The actual presence of Christ in his Church "is also of an eschatological nature, since the Spirit constitutes the

<sup>43</sup>*Valamo*, Section 4, p. 177, para. 44.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.* Section 1, p. 174, para. 9.

<sup>45</sup>*Cf. ibid.*, Section 1, para. 8 and Section 3, p. 177, paras 39-40.

<sup>46</sup>Fourth Roman Catholic-Orthodox Joint Commission, Agreed Statement on Faith, Sacraments, and the Unity of the Church Bari, Italy, 9-16 June 1987, from now on *Bari*), see English text in: *Information Service* 64 (1987), Section 3, p. 84, para. 15; see also text in Greek/French in: *Episkepsis*, 390 (1987) 5-15.

<sup>47</sup>*Munich*, Section 1, p. 108, para. 5 (c).

earnest of the perfect realization of God's design for the world."<sup>48</sup> Orthodox and Roman Catholics affirm that "...in this perspective the Church appears as the community of the New Covenant which Christ through the Holy Spirit gathers about himself and builds up as his body. Through the Church, Christ is present in history; through it he achieves the salvation of the world."<sup>49</sup> Both sides avoid a merely local limitation to the Eucharist; so they add: "the koinonia is eschatological."<sup>50</sup> And therefore, everything begins in the Eucharist through conversion and reconciliation, with an ultimate presupposition which is always "repentance" and confession."<sup>51</sup> It is also this koinonia, as the central event within the Church, which is also and on the same basis "kerygmatic,"<sup>52</sup> proclaiming the event of the mystery of God to the assemblies, to the whole world, to the whole community and the whole creation, and "the response of faith is given by all."<sup>53</sup> Thus the eucharist is "inseparably sacrament and word since in it the incarnate Word sanctifies in the Spirit";<sup>54</sup> and that is why the whole of the liturgy and not only the reading of the Holy Scriptures, constitutes the proclamation of the Word under the form of doxology and prayer. The Word proclaimed "is made flesh and becomes sacramental."<sup>55</sup>

Old Catholics and Orthodox, who have in principle concluded their theological dialogue and came to an agreement on doctrinal issues, present the concept of the "local church" as "a fellowship of believers united around the bishop and the priests and as the Body of Christ, each local church is the manifestation of the whole Christ in one particular place. It represents the sacramental reality of the whole Church in its own locality . . . each local church, on the contrary, has that life in its fulness."<sup>56</sup>

Thus, for all the differences in custom and usage, the life of the local church is in essence one and the same: "There is one Body and

<sup>48</sup>Valamo, Introduction, p. 174, para. 3-4; cf. also Section 4 p. 177, para. 44.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., para. 4.

<sup>50</sup>Munich, Section 2, p. 109, para. 2.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid.; cf. also Dublin, pp. 32-34, paras 53-65.

<sup>56</sup>Old Catholic-Orthodox, *Agreed Statement on Ecclesiology*, Section 3/3, p. 405, paras 23, 24.

one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all . . ." (Eph 4.4-6). There *are not* many bodies, but the one Body of Christ, undivided and whole, in each place. This unity of life in the local churches reflects the unity of the Holy Trinity itself. "Since the Church in this present time still awaits deliverance from all evil and must therefore pray God so to deliver it, to make it perfect in his love and bring it together from the ends of the earth into his kingdom"<sup>57</sup> the local churches must devotedly maintain the essential unity given to them, and constantly "struggle against the forces of sin and division."<sup>58</sup>

However, this eucharistic communion as actual union with Christ for the divided world becomes a foundation stone and a springboard of social interest and welfare preparing for an eternal fellowship (Mt 26.26-29; Jn 6.32-59; 1 Cor 11.20-34). This understanding of the Church was expressed centuries ago by St John of Damascus who wrote on Holy Communion as a union because through the Church we share Christ's flesh and his divinity." "Yes," he wrote, "we have communion and we are united with one another through the Church. For since we partake of one bread, we all become one body of Christ and one blood and members of one of another, being one body with Christ."<sup>59</sup>

At this point, rather than say one *is* and one *is not*, the true Church of Christ, Orthodox and Roman Catholics begin with the declaration that both can accept: "The Body of Christ is one. There exists only one Church of God."<sup>60</sup> But they continue to affirm with an assertion, which again could be accepted by both, about the local church: "Each Eucharistic assembly is truly the holy church of God, the body of Christ, in communion with the first community of the disciples and with all who throughout the world celebrate and have celebrated the memorial of the Lord."<sup>61</sup>

Meanwhile there seems to be a cloudiness about what eucharistic communion means when Anglican and Orthodox go on to affirm that the Eucharist is the visible expression of the catholicity of the Church,

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. para. 24; cf. *Didaché* 10.5.9.4.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid. para. 24.

<sup>59</sup>Saint John Damascus, *exposition of the Orthodox Faith* PG 94.1153A; see also Saint John Chrysostom, *Homily* 46, in PG 260.

<sup>60</sup>*Munich*, Section 3, 111, para. 1.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid.



as evidenced in the following: "The catholicity of particular local churches, each of which, being in eucharistic communion with all the other local churches, manifests in its own place and time the one catholic Church. These local churches, in faithful response to their own particular missionary situation, have developed a wide diversity in their life. As long as their witness to the one faith remains *unimpaired*, such diversity is to be seen not as a deficiency or cause for division, but as a mark of the faithfulness of the one Spirit who distributes to each according to his will (1 Cor 12.11)."<sup>62</sup> How, specifically, does each church determine whether the witness of the one faith is unimpaired? Does each church assume that this witness is unimpaired in itself, but is impaired in the other church?<sup>63</sup>

In relation to the eucharistic celebration, Roman Catholics and Orthodox agreed that "the entire assembly, each according to his or her status, is 'liturge' of the koinonia, and is so only through the Spirit."<sup>64</sup> ". . .there are varieties of ministries, but the same Lord (. . .). To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (1 Cor 12.5,7).<sup>65</sup> The koinonia culminates in the celebration of the Eucharist in which Christian initiation is completed, through which all become one body of Christ. . . .In fact, bearing the variety of gifts of the Spirit, the local Church has at its centre the bishop, whose communion realizes the unity of all and expresses the fulness of the Church . . . "This unity of the local church (in an eucharistic perspective) is inseparable from the universal communion of the churches. . . ."<sup>66</sup>

Using eucharistic imagery therefore to validate the use of eucharistic ecclesiology as a principle to be employed in the dialogues on the way to church union, we may see this confirmed also in particular in the Moscow Statement when Anglicans and Orthodox agree that "the eucharistic teaching and practice of the churches, mutually confessed, constitutes an essential factor for the understanding which can lead to reunion between Orthodox and Anglican churches."<sup>67</sup> This essential requirement is based upon the understanding

<sup>62</sup>Dublin, p. 12, para. 12 (c).

<sup>63</sup>Cf. P. Baktis, "The Dublin Statement: Investigations and Analysis," *One in Christ*, 2 (1989) 171-72.

<sup>64</sup>Valamo, Section 3, p. 175, para. 24; cf. also *Munich*, Section 2, p. 109, para. 2.

<sup>65</sup>Valamo, Section 3, p. 175, para. 24.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., para. 26.

<sup>67</sup>Moscow, p. 88, para. 22.

that "in each local eucharistic celebration the visible unity and catholicity of the Church is fully manifested";<sup>68</sup> and it also allows for other aspects of churches' theologies to add in the process of union, but eucharistic theology is placed as the most essential factor. In the light of this they affirm mutually that "the eucharistic understanding of the Church affirms primarily the presence of Jesus Christ in the Church, which is his body, and in the Eucharist. Through the action of the Holy Spirit, all faithful communicants share in the one body of Christ and become one body with him."<sup>69</sup> Thus the Eucharist actualizes the Church. The Christian community has a basic sacramental character. The Church can be described as a "synaxis" of an "ekklesia" which is—in its essence—a worshipping and eucharistic community. The Church, celebrating "the Eucharistic becomes fully itself, that is koinonia, fellowship-communion." The Church celebrates the Eucharist as the central act of its existence, in which the ecclesial community, as a living reality confessing its faith, receives its realization. Thus the eucharistic action of the Church is "the Passover from the old to the new; it is the action of the Holy Spirit." When it is articulated, "the *Epiclesis* voices the work of the Spirit with the Father in the consecration of the elements as the body and the blood of Christ."<sup>70</sup>

However, this thesis brings disagreement concerning the issue of communion and intercommunion, particularly with the Anglicans. The Dublin Statement openly affirms that "it is clear that there has been a considerable development in ecumenical and inter-church relations in recent years which has resulted in the Anglicans sharing the Eucharist with members of other churches on special ecumenical occasions, in times of special need, or on a more regular basis."<sup>71</sup> The Anglican tradition "accepts as legitimate, in certain situations, the use of intercommunion as a means towards the attainment of full organic unity." On the other hand, the Orthodox disagree and completely reject the notion of intercommunion because "there can be communion only between local churches that have a unity of *faith, ministry and sacraments*."<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup>Dublin, p. 47, para. 109 (b).

<sup>69</sup>Moscow, p. 88, paras. 22-23; cf. also Dublin, *ibid*.

<sup>70</sup>Moscow, pp. 88-89, paras. 24, 26, 27.

<sup>71</sup>Dublin, p. 14, para. 18 (a).

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15, para. 20 (b).

In fact, this results in that for the Orthodox, "communion" involves a mystical and sanctifying unity created by the body and blood of Christ, which makes them "one body and one blood (sessomoi and synemoi) with Christ"<sup>73</sup> and therefore they can have "no differences of faith."<sup>74</sup> This eucharistic "uneasiness" with the Anglicans challenges the Orthodox and Roman Catholics, by repeating the Dublin declaration, to affirm that "because of this reciprocal recognition that the faith handed down in each local church is one and at the same time (as are the priesthood and the sacrament) that they recognize each other as genuine churches of God and that each of the faithful is welcomed by the churches as a brother or a sister in the faith."<sup>75</sup> Therefore, this "communion in the sacraments expresses the identity and unicity of the true faith which the churches share";<sup>76</sup> and Old Catholics will affirm that "where communion is violated, the Lord's Supper can no longer be celebrated together. Restoration of eucharistic communion, while division in faith continues is a contradiction in terms since the churches live in separation from one another. . . eucharistic communion—so they conclude—is a manifestation of communion of faith in one Church."<sup>77</sup>

### *Summarizing*

The inheritance from the past expressed in beliefs, practices, values, and even forms is not an ossified and static relic but a vigorous force augmented and strengthened by the contributions of succeeding generations of the people of God through the centuries. Churches and confessions, in their multilateral and bilateral conversations, today need this kind of listening theologically to each other's doctrines in order to find the common roots of the Christian Tradition stated by Jesus Christ himself. Theology should not be considered as monolythic. There is also a renewed interest in the bilateral dialogues to identify what churches consider authentic theology—a theology which understands the content of divine revelation and through faith

<sup>73</sup>Ibid.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>*Bari* Section 5, p. 85, para. 21.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., para. 23.

<sup>77</sup>Old Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue, *Agreed Statement on the Sacraments* (Kavala, Greece, 12-19 October 1987), see English text in *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, 8 (1988) 74; see also text in Greek/French in: *Episkepsis*, 394 (1988) 6.

leads to a communion with God and fellow human beings. This revelation consists of trinitarian theology, Christology and eschatology according to God's plan for the salvation of the world. There is also a movement among churches and confessions today towards a biblical theology in the light of patristic exegesis, and the experience of the local church—the Christian community in history.

The emphasis on the centrality of the eucharist in the Church is hardly unique to Orthodox and Roman Catholic conversations. It is a recurrent theme in many of the recent bilateral and multilateral dialogues. Yet on the basis of their shared understanding of the eucharist and its implications for church life, Orthodox and Roman Catholics are able to make certain affirmations with which other Christians might have difficulties. Nothing reveals the advanced degree of agreement which already exists between the two theologies which brings the two churches closer. Rather, there has been the slow, patient working out of a principle enunciated even before the dialogue began: Start with what Orthodox and Roman Catholics have in common—above all, the sacraments and only from within this broader context go to points on which there is disagreement. Of course, there have been many sudden changes of direction, even if some new and painful issues (uniatism, proselytism) have emerged which need to be clarified further.<sup>78</sup>

However, without any doubt, the boundaries of bilateral dialogues are today becoming broad enough in order to allow a certain freedom of movement as well as full expression. Nevertheless, all theological conversations have a common task and goal, namely to seek unity among churches in the light of true Christian faith and life. Maintaining a balance between historical facts of the early times and of contemporary situations in which churches live and which they experience is absolutely essential and should be kept in the theologians' mind who sometimes are sceptical of reductionism and relativism and they insist on loyalty to the experience of the Church in history, theology and tradition.

Loyalty to tradition of the Church is not static, but rather dynamic in the sense that it permits dialogue and renewal. The theology of truth is committed to preserve the theology of undivided Christianity

<sup>78</sup>Sixth Roman Catholic-Orthodox Joint Commission, *Declaration on Uniatism and Proselytism* (Freising, FRG, 6-15 June 1990), see English text in: *Information Service*, 73 (1990), 52-53; see also text in Greek/French in *Episkepsis*, 443 (1990) 11-13.

and indeed its identity, but also to share its convictions and perceptions within different traditions and religious beliefs.

Where does this dialogical-theological exercise on union negotiations lead from here? How do theologians from different traditions and confessions perceive the future of these bilateral conversations and the goal that should be achieved? Some see them as a vibrant and appealing call to unity; others have expressed high hopes not only for their future, but also because they interrelate this concern with the future of Christianity. Still others fearfully complain that the bilateral dialogues are facing today a chaotic situation emphasized by an individualism and fragmentation; finally others also admire the fact that a lot of hostilities and difficulties of the past have already been overcome, and considerable common agreements have been formulated on convergent issues.

The more the churches come closer theologically, being in dialogue and agreeing in joint statements, the more they feel the "sacred zeal" to sometimes protect their particularities in defense of Christian faith. Do they really want visible and organic church unity? Are they ready to make sacrifices towards that end? The road to unity is costly and painful. If it is grasped and enacted as a process of change and renewal, resulting from their listening in common to the prophetic Word of God, and requesting the repentance-answer, a common confession of the one true church of Christ and a conversion of hearts and minds is needed in the light of the contemporary secularized world.

Finally the impression, arising from the different dialogues and when viewed emphatically and analyzed together, is that the ecumenical movement, both East and West, is "on the move" and not static. It is much easier to understand the different nature and goal of each dialogue, the continuous repetition which are unavoidable within the statements, the various styles and languages, the emphasis on the biblical references or not, their relevance to contemporary theology or not. There can be little doubt about the value and achievements that have been obtained. As a consequence, some schemes may have collapsed in their search for the necessary agreement in faith to carry unity schemes, but nevertheless encouraging strides are being made. An appropriate stage has now been reached of the goal towards which churches are moving. Doctrinal agreements *are not* an end in themselves, but sought in order to move the churches into a closer relationship in faith, life and practice.

Therefore, the six dialogues undertaken by the Orthodox Church are continuing with their engagement in order to reach "the day of the Lord,"<sup>79</sup> the "full eucharistic communion" in simplicity, sincerity, in oneness of mind (cf. Acts 2.46) and in common faith and reconciliation.

The patient and serious approach to theological dialogue exemplified in the work of the joint commissions offers hope for the eventual restoration of such a communion between churches. While such dialogues will not in themselves bring about the full and perfect unity of the churches, any unity is hard to imagine without God's will and that of human beings, too.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites' *Neon Martyrologion*

---

EFTHALIA MAKRIS WALSH

THE ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN FEMALE MARTYRS OF NIKODEMOS THE Hagiorites' *Neo Martyrologion*<sup>1</sup> provide models for a defense of the Orthodox Christian faith and project an image of Islam and a stance toward Islam to the Christian faithful. The martyr's acts could be used to encourage resistance during a period when social, economic, and political pressures clearly were exerted to support submission to Islam.

The acts provide excellent documentation of the part played by poor and uneducated village women in resisting Islamic conversion attempts during the eighteenth century. The texts express the concept of conversion associated with assuming the Islamic faith as "Na Tourkisi" (become Turkish). The aim of this paper is to understand more about these female neomartyrs, their acts and miracles, the situation that stimulated the martyrdoms, and the audience for which these materials were intended.

The analysis will be concerned with women and the lives of the women neomartyrs and will compare Byzantine and post-Byzantine literary documents to reveal certain aspects of the mental world of the later period. The vehicle for this rhetoric was a persisting Byzantine cultural form, the martyr act. The female martyr literature of the martyrologion adheres to the ethos, models, and literary form to the Byzantines, but the neomartyr acts now emphasize the problems

<sup>1</sup>Nikodemou tou Agioreitou, *Neon Martyrologion*, ed. by P. B. Paschos (Athens, 1961), p. 4. Hereafter referred to as NM. The translations in this paper are mine.



and traditions of a period, and the large amount of it that is available makes it a fertile subject for study. This Orthodox literature also reflects awareness and knowledge of Islamic social structures, judicial procedures, governmental jurisdictions and ranks, and theology.

The topic is of special interest today since most literature of the past does not offer much insight into the activities of ordinary women. That the difficult task of defending the faith was undertaken by both men and women is amply documented in the *Neon Martyrologion*.<sup>2</sup> This paper, however, will focus on the women neomartyrs and demonstrate the importance of poor, uneducated village women in the preservation of the faith after the fall of the Byzantine Empire. Not only familial, marital, and erotic themes, but the noteworthy presence of other women characters and female situations strongly support the notion that the Lives of the female neomartyrs were prepared for an audience of simple women.

The writer and compiler of the martyrologion, Nikodemos, 1749-1809, an Athonite monastic, played an important role in disseminating the idea of resistance and martyrdom.<sup>3</sup> Nikodemos not only urged his audience to resist pressures to convert and remain Christians to death (NM, 17), but he also exhorted crypto-Christians and those who had either voluntarily or under force apostatized to Islam to return again to the faith and to seek martyrdom (NM, 18).<sup>4</sup> The volume

<sup>2</sup>Demetrios Constantelos, "The 'Neomartyrs' as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 24 (1978) 232.

<sup>3</sup>Peter A. Chamberas, trans., George S. Bebis, introduction, *Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain: A Handbook of Spiritual Counsel* (New York, 1989), p. 1. The introduction provides an excellent survey of Nikodemos and his work and a good bibliography. See also Constantine Cavarinos, *St. Nikodemos, the Hagiorite*, Modern Orthodox Saints Series, vol. 3 (Belmont, 1974); George Bebis, "St. Nikodemos," *Post-Byzantine Ecclesiastical Personalities* Nomikos M. Vaporia, ed. (Brookline, 1978); Theokletos Dionysiates, *Άγιος Νικοδήμιος ὁ Ἀγιορείτης: Ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ Ἔργα του*, ed. by Papademetriou (Athens: 1959); Nikodemos Paulopoulos, *Τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἁγίου Νικοδήμου*, 150th Anniversary of the Greek Independence Series (Athens, 1976); Nomikos M. Vaporia, "The Price of Faith: Some Reflections of Nikodemos Hagiorites and His Struggle against Islam," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 24 (1978) 185-215; Nikolaos Gr. Zacharopoulos, "Ὁ Ἅγιος Νικοδήμιος ὡς διδάσκαλος τῆς πνευματικῆς ζωῆς," *Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον, Χαριστήριον εἰς τὸν Παναγιώτην Κ. Χρήστου* (Thessalonike, 1967), 465-86; and unsigned articles on "Ὁ Ἅγιος Νικοδήμιος ὁ Ἀγιορείτης καὶ ὁ σύγχρονος Ἑλληνικὸς διαφωτισμός," *Orthodoxos Typos* 24, n. 614 (July 6, 1984); and 24, n. 615 (July 13, 1984).

<sup>4</sup>The course of action Nikodemos counselled was: a) "Go to a spiritual leader . . . and confess the denial that you have made, and your other sins, and reveal to him

published in 1796 is now one of the standard sources on the neomartyrs and reflects Nikodemos' ideas and concerns, and those of the Athonite community in the eighteenth century.<sup>5</sup> Wherever the neomartyrs may have originated, many of their activities, the events in their lives, and miracles after their deaths occurred in Constantinople, Chios, Thessalonike, and Greece, or villages in Western Asia Minor or islands off its coast—the Athonite sphere of influence.<sup>6</sup> Many monastic communities, among them Mt. Athos, remained bastions of Orthodoxy throughout Ottoman rule.<sup>7</sup>

The term neomartyrs was used by Nikodemos, himself, to identify these important post-Byzantine saints. Nikodemos who was instrumental in the hesychastic revival of that period also published the *Philokalia*<sup>8</sup> and was a proponent of Gregory Palamas and the prayer of the heart. While Nikodemos does not refer to hesychasm by name in the acts of the female neomartyrs, he does portray several of them in that context, as will be shown below.

His treatment of the female neomartyrs in his martyrologion, however, marks a major departure from high Byzantine hagiographic tradition. Almost invariably, as will be shown, patristic and Byzantine martyrs were depicted as highborn, intelligent, and persuasive women, often actively involved in conversion of the pagan masses.

It should be noted that Nikodemos valued the neomartyrs highly, considering them in no sense inferior or secondary to the early martyrs, but as equal in merit and honor. They differed in one thing only—the more difficult theological task facing the neomartyrs, as Nikodemos explains in the martyrologion introduction. Combating

---

your desire to become a martyr, then b) ask to receive a second holy Chrismation . . . c) withdraw to a quiet place and pray to God with fasting, sleeplessness, and healing tears . . . and ask that he light his divine love in your heart; d) receive the divine mystery (ie., holy Communion) . . . and e) after all this, rise, and go to the place where you first denied Christ and there deny the faith (Islam) that you had received and confess again your faith in Christ and by this confession spill your blood, and die . . .” (NM, 19). For an English translation of the introduction see Nomikos M. Vaporis, “Introduction to the Neon Martyrologion,” *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 24, (1978) 202-15.

<sup>5</sup>Chamberas, *Nikodemos*, p. 18.

<sup>6</sup>Constantelos, “Neomartyrs” p. 231.

<sup>7</sup>Cyril Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (New York, 1980), p. 113.

<sup>8</sup>G.E.H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, Kallistos Ware, trans. and eds. *Philokalia* (3 vols, London, 1979, 1981, and 1984).

Muslims on the plane of theology posed problems because of the subtlety of Christian trinitarian conceptions of God as compared with the simpler Islamic conception of deity. The early martyrs "battled against polytheism, and idolatry, which was an obvious impiety, and in regard to which it was difficult to deceive a logical mind, but the neomartyrs have had to fight against the one-personed, *prosopon*, [one as compared with the three persons or hypostases of the Trinity] monotheism of another faith, which has a hidden impiety that deceives the the mind easily" (NM, 12).

This paper will first subject the acts and *akolouthies*—service books, to a close reading to describe the reactions of the martyrs and their families to pressures for Islamic conversion and to show that the female neomartyr acts were intended for a female audience. Nikodemos' use of earlier Byzantine themes, such as hesychasm and the bride of Christ motif will be noted and commented on. Finally, the women neomartyrs will be compared and contrasted with those of the early church as presented in the tenth century menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes.<sup>9</sup>

Facilitating the task is the fact the *Neon Martyrologion* includes only five women in its listing of ninety-three martyrs. They are Matrona of Volisos, Chios, who died in 1462 (NM, 143); Argyre of Proussa in 1725 (NM, 114); Kyranna of Avyssoka, Thessalonike in 1751 (NM, 133); Akylina from Zagklivere, Thessalonike in 1764 (NM, 186); and Chryse of Slatena, Moglenon Bulgaria in 1795 (NM, 258). The relatively small number of female martyr Lives is not unusual in the history of Christian martyr acts, although women martyrs were honored and highly revered from the earliest periods of Christianity.

### *Some Historical and Methodological Considerations*

Historical evidence does document the importance of poor simple people in the defence of faith after the fall of Byzantium. The wholesale exodus to the West of Christian monastics, aristocrats and other traditional supporters of the Church left the perpetuation of Orthodox Christianity in the hands of the poorest, least educated people.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Symeon Metaphrastes, *Ἀπαντα*, PG 114, 115, and 116. I have followed the more accurate listing of Metaphrastes' texts prepared by H. Delehay, "Synopsis Metaphrastica," *Synaxaires byzantines, menologes, typica*, ed. by F. Halkin (London, 1977), 267-92.

<sup>10</sup>Ioannis E. Anastasiou and Athanasios G. Geromichalos "Σχέδιασμα περί τῶν Νεομαρτύρων Μνήμη 1821," *Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου*

Also contributing to the leadership vacuum was the Church whose fear of provoking the Turkish government kept it from officially announcing a policy of opposition, according to Vacalopoulos.<sup>11</sup>

Vryonis<sup>12</sup> and others have written that although the Ottoman rulers avowedly supported a policy of toleration of other "religions of the Book," they actually discouraged them. Recently that view has been challenged and some scholars maintain that the Ottoman rule was not so oppressive. However, evidence for the idea that there was greater Turkish interest in forced conversion in the eighteenth and nineteenth century is the increased numbers of documented neomartyrs in that period.<sup>13</sup> The large number of mass conversions and martyrdoms that occurred then may be due "at least in part to the unfavourable conditions created in the Balkans by the Russo-Turkish wars . . . when the danger of Greek disaffection became more serious as foreign propaganda . . . grew and Turkish policy was therefore more interested in conversion than it had been."<sup>14</sup>

This paper will not address this dispute, focusing rather on the information that Nikodemos presents in the *Neon Martyrologion*. It should be emphasized that Nikodemos' work is not an attempt at an historical account, as we know it, but documentation through the genre of hagiography. Hagiography has as one of its aim the encouragement of resistance to oppressors of the Christian faith. The concept of the martyr as a holocaust and a burnt offering, a thanks offering, who participates in Christ's saving work — the continuing battle against demonic forces — was present in hagiographic literature from the earliest church period. Polycarp's martyr act<sup>15</sup> which was

---

Θεσσαλονίκης, (Thessalonike, 1971), p.9.

<sup>11</sup>Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation: The Byzantine Period. 1204-1461*, trans. by Ian Moles, revised by the author (New Brunswick, 1971), 93-95.

<sup>12</sup>Speros Vryonis, Jr. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor* (Berkeley, 1971), p. 356.

<sup>13</sup>Constantelos, "Neomartyrs," p. 231.

<sup>14</sup>D. A. Zakynthinos, *The Making of Modern Greece: From Byzantine to Independence*, trans. with and introduction by K.R. Johnstone (Totowa, 1976), p. 21. See also Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, *Ιστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ! Τουρκοκρατία 1453-1669* (Thessalonike, 1964), pp. 45-53 and 202-08.

<sup>15</sup>The Martyrdom of Polycarp, ed. and trans. by Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 3. See also Frances M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*, Patristic

used as a model for many other martyrs describes him as bound "like a noble ram chosen for an oblation from a great flock, a holocaust prepared and made acceptable to God" (eis prospboran, holokautoma). And the example of the noble Maccabean mother who watches the martyrdom of her seven sons, is also depicted by Saint John Chrysostom and other patristic and Byzantine writers in that context,<sup>16</sup> as are many other male and female martyrs.

Using literary documents like saints' lives to expose the thinking and categories of the Byzantine era has been frowned on by many positivist historians<sup>17</sup> who emphasized historicity as the legitimating criterion of authenticity and tended to discredit or minimize martyr acts because they were deemed to be too miraculous or fantastic. Miracles, embellishment, and exaggeration, however, were certainly not alien to the Byzantines nor to the people of the Ottoman Empire. They are intrinsic to the genre of hagiography.

Patlagean and other scholars working with Byzantine hagiographic texts have maintained that all saints' Lives and acts, however stereotypical and unhistorical they may appear, are authentic and potentially productive sources of historical information.<sup>18</sup> The saint's contest with the demonic forces is the underlying model in the saint's

---

Monography Series, v. 5, (Philadelphia, 1979), 228.

<sup>16</sup>2 and 4 Macc., *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha*, ed. by Bruce M. Metzger (New York). See also Saint John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Maccabees*, PG 56.

<sup>17</sup>The genre of religious literature has had many critics, from those who doubted that the martyrdoms occurred to those who viewed martyrdom as pathological or psychologically suspect, as Constantelos has pointed out; See Constantelos, *Neomartyrs*, p. 229. Discussions on whether the martyr acts were historically accurate or authentic or were stereotypical legends preoccupied scholars for much of this century and were often pursued with denominational bias and with motives other than that of understanding the purpose and context of the acts. In an attempt to rescue the martyr acts from their critics the Bollandist hagiologist Hippolyte Delehaye separated the real from the imagined martyrdoms, placing the acts in six categories in ascending ranks of authenticity and historic veracity—they ranged from those based on official records, or eyewitness accounts—to those that were romances or imaginary tales or deceptive forgeries. See H. Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints*, trans. by Donald Attwater (New York, 1983), 89. However useful this approach might be for the collecting, preserving and dating of texts, it makes distinctions that the originators of the martyr acts and the cults that developed around the martyr probably never intended.

<sup>18</sup>Evelyn Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography and Social History," *The Saints and Their Cults*, ed. by Stephen Wilson, (Cambridge, 1983), p. 102.

life as Patlagean has theorized.<sup>19</sup> It is through combats with demonic forces that the ascetic, as a result of patience and perseverance, is invested with great power. With Matrona and some of Metaphrastes' women, ultimate victory over the demonic forces is manifested in miracles.

### *A Close Reading*

While not applied explicitly in the "close reading" that follows, Patlagean's structuralist approach, which looks at the subconscious level "in the hope of understanding the mental categories of ancient Byzantine hagiography," was influential.<sup>20</sup>

A careful reading of the Lives in Nikodemos will show that Matrona differs considerably from the other four women neomartyrs included in the martyrologion. Matrona is an ascetic and a monastic miracle worker with hesychastic overtones, while the four others all are lay women who go to their death as martyrs for refusing to deny their faith and convert to Islam. The characterization of representatives of both modes of sainthood as martyrs is an acknowledgment of the varied audience of women that the martyrologion is addressing—both lay women and monastics. The equating of asceticism with martyrdom follows an early Church tradition as Nikodemos, himself, points out in the introduction to the martyrologion when he cites Saint John Chrysostom, who "identified as martyrs not only those who die a martyr's death, but those who show themselves by choice and desire" (NM, 14)—that is, those who choose to witness to their faith by living an ascetic life of martyrdom of the flesh.

According to the Matrona account, she, like the great Anthony—to whom she refers—after years of ascetic contests and trials, and through her "apathia and her familiarity with God," defeats the devil when she turns gold into charcoal. The gold was placed by the devil in the foundation excavation during the building of a new church to ensnare Matrona (NM, 145). Matrona, in a modification of a scriptural miracle, also dramatically casts out the demons from a sick woman's breast (NM, 152).

Although the Lives of the other four neomartyrs contain certain distinctive variations that are of interest, generally they are variations on a single theme. The neomartyrs are virtuous, young, and

<sup>19</sup>Ibid. p. 106.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid. p. 104.

beautiful village girls living with their Christian families. Kyranna, Akylina, and Chryse are virgins and Argyre newly married. Attempts are made by local Muslims to seduce and/or convert them. The accounts insinuate that the Muslims' intentions are dishonorable and demonic. The young women are all falsely charged, face judicial trials of all sorts, but refuse to deny their Christian faith and to "become Muslims." They are imprisoned, interrogated, and tortured, and ultimately die receiving the crown of martyrdom. Demonic intervention, when it occurs, is in the actions of the Muslims.

Another distinction between the two categories of women neomartyrs is immediately evident from the dates of their deaths. Matrona died some 250 or 300 years earlier than the others. The female patron saint of Chios, Matrona was widely revered in her lifetime when the island was still under Genoese control.<sup>21</sup> That she is from a different period raises the question of why Matrona is included in a collection of what are said to be martyrs of the Ottoman period. A partial answer lies in the many and detailed miracles of the eighteenth century that the martyrologion attributes to Matrona. What is equally evident is that Nikodemos considers Matrona an important variety of saint and he gives her special treatment in the martyrologion. She is the only woman martyr (and one of the few martyrs of either sex) to have a special *akolouthia* included. The texts include her Life, acts, and miracles, as well as the great vespers, orthros, and pertinent material for the Liturgy celebrating her feast day. The materials are distinctive also in that Nikodemos attributes them to a particular writer, Neilos of Chios, Metropolitan of Rhodes. Of the other female martyr acts, only Chryse's mentions the source of information about her. Father Timothy, the head of Stavroniketa Monastery on the Holy Mountain, who was also Chryse's spiritual father, told Nikodemos of her martyrdom (NM, 260).

The four other women martyr accounts are presented in shorter literary formats than Matrona's. Though spare, they are dramatic and gripping. Delehay, writing on the neomartyrs, observed that their acts had the ring of sincerity and conviction.<sup>22</sup> Typical of the four women is the beautiful, pious virgin Chryse. She unwittingly and unwillingly attracted an "Hagarinos"—the Byzantine term used by

<sup>21</sup>Philip Argenti and H.J. Rose, *The Folklore of Chios* (Cambridge, 1949), 1, 129.

<sup>22</sup>Hippolyte Delehay, "Greek Neomartyrs," *Melange d'hagiographie Greque et Latine, Subsidia Hagiographica*, 42, (Bruxelles, 1966), 252.

Nikodemos for a Muslim—who vainly “attempted to seduce her, promising marriage and offering other inducements, if she would accept his religion.” Chryse, however, refused. And . . . “calling on the name of her Lord Jesus Christ to help her, she answered with great presence ‘I believe in my Christ, and I worship him and only him do I recognize as my bridegroom, who I shall never deny even though you may inflict thousands of tortures, and cut my body into a thousand pieces’ ” (NM, 259). This did not stop the Turk and the trials continued until her death.

The issue of intermarriage with Muslim men in villages with both Muslim and Christian populations presented problems for Christian families and the Church. Relationships involving Muslims and their marriage proposals are always suspect in the texts. Hostile references are made of the Ottoman’s lies and to their ulterior motives in dealing with the women . . . “he wanted to bring her (around) to his purpose” as Kyranna’s Life describes attempts of the village’s Muslim *soumpasa* (a second-ranking Ottoman official in charge of the village)—and then by the Janissaries—to convince her to become Muslim (NM, 133).

The insecure legal position of Christians in these mixed villages is also indicated in the martyr acts. Argyre’s husband sends her from Prousa to Constantinople because he thinks she can get a fairer trial there (NM, 114). However, even in Constantinople laws are not carried out properly. An imprisoned Christian objects strenuously that it was against Muslim law that the jail keeper was allowing the Janissaries to enter the prison and torture Kyranna, who had been kidnapped from her village near Thessalonike (NM, 135).

The issue of continence or virginity, present in Matrona and in many of the early female martyr acts, is not raised in the lives of the four village martyrs. There is little direct comment on the desirability or undesirability of virginity or of marriage for a Christian woman. The martyrs are sexually desirable, but they are pursued by the wrong men, men who insist that the martyrs deny their faith. Except for Matrona, neither marriage nor sexuality are taboo, but marriage or seduction by Muslim men is. In Matrona’s case marriage is clearly what her parents except of her. She has a dowry and her sisters are married, but she twice rejects parental pressure to marry. “She wanted to preserve her virginity and cleanliness so that she might become the good and blameless bride of the deathless bridegroom Christ” (NM, 144). For the other martyrs, however, the



choice is to die as the bride of Christ rather than marry or have sexual relations with Turks who want them to assume their faith and "become Muslim." When a Turk promised to marry Chryse if she would adopt his religion, she cried out, "Only Christ do I recognize as my bridegroom, whom I never want to deny!" (NM, 259). So also said Kyranna while under torture: "I am a Christian and have the Lord my Jesus Christ, as my bridegroom to whom I offer as a dowry my virginity and . . . for his love I am ready to spill my blood . . ." (NM, 134). Akylina also refused to deny Christ: "The Turks began to seduce and to make promises of gifts if she would only deny her faith, but the bride of Christ, having in her heart love (*erota*) for Christ, her spiritual groom, would not think of it" (NM, 187). Even the married Argyre, ". . . endured all for the love and passion which she had for her bridegroom, Christ" (NM 114).

The martyrs all identify themselves as brides of Christ. Here is clearly a continuing theme from the patristic and Byzantine period. The idea of the wise virgins who are ready and waiting for the arrival of the bridegroom, Christ, is central to much ascetic and monastic literature and theology. Many of the Church Fathers wrote of the soul as the bride in search of union with her bridegroom, Christ.<sup>23</sup> Through this union the saints ". . . became great champions of faith; by a good confession at their time of witness, they were drenched with myrrh in their struggle on behalf of their religion."

Parents and sisters play a role in the accounts. However, only Akylina's mother supports and encourages her daughter to die rather than deny her faith (NM, 186). Here is clearly articulated the desired maternal response. The mother stands in stark contrast to her husband, who "became a Muslim" to escape the death penalty after killing an Ottoman neighbor during an argument. According to the martyrologion account she remained in the faith of Christ and "was not remiss in always teaching her daughter to stand firm in her faith in Christ and not to deny Jesus Christ" (NM, 186). Before Akylina's trial for refusing to become a Muslim her mother implored her not to give in. "Behold my most beloved and most sweet daughter Akylina . . . the hour has come for which every day I taught and nurtured you. Be then a dutiful child and listen to my teachings and stand strong in the tortures you have to endure and not to deny

<sup>23</sup>Gregory of Nyssa, *The Song of Songs*, trans. and introduction by Casimir McCambley, (Brookline, 1987), pp. 5-30.

Christ" (NM, 187). When after repeated torture Akylina is brought home to die her mother asked what she had said to the authorities. With her last breath, Akylina responds, "What else did I want to do, Oh my mother, except that which you ordered me to do. Behold, according to the agreement we made, I kept the confession of my faith." And her mother, raised her hands and eyes heavenward glorifying God" (NM, 188).

Fear is notably present as a motivating factor in the behavior of the other neomartyrs' parents, who attempt to discourage their daughters from martyrdom. After following Kyranna to Constantinople where she was to be tried, fear caused her parents to hide (NM, 133). Fear also motivated Chryse's parents and sisters under threat of death to plead with her to become a Muslim . . . "even though they did not wish to do it" (NM, 259). Matrona's pious parents also grieved when she secretly withdrew to the mountain to engage in ascetic trials. After much searching they found her but did not think it right that she remain there alone, and she returned home with them for a time (NM, 144).

Daughters dominate the scene in Nikodemos' female martyr acts. Sons or brothers, if there were any, are never mentioned. Matrona, for example, is the youngest of seven daughters and Chryse has three sisters. When Matrona is undergoing ascetic trials on the mountain, her sister brings her food. When Matrona leaves there for the female monasteries in town, she prefers the hermitage "*monydrion*" where only three women lived—a woman and her two daughters. Later, when Matrona receives her monastic robes, she has dealings with the abbess and with other nuns and becomes the abbess herself. She dies surrounded by the women having forgiven their sins and been forgiven hers by them.

Women, both Christian and Muslim, are involved also in the female neomartyr's trials and tortures while they are imprisoned. Here again is evidence of a mixed population of Muslims and Christians living together in small villages and towns. Chryse is handed over to the wives of the Muslims so that they can convince her to become Muslim because ". . . as it is known, women are by nature more competent than men in beguiling or tricking, and especially their own (i.e. the Muslim) women" (NM, 259). After six months of exhaustive teaching and exhorting, however, the Muslim women were unable to change Chryse's mind. The imprisoned Kyranna was also the victim of Muslim women. "They insulted and screamed at another Christian prisoner,

when he said he would appeal to an Ottoman Pasha (because of improprieties at the prison) . . . But even these Muslim women began screaming loudly and were appaled when the jailkeeper hung Kyranna and began beating her with a splintered board." (NM, 135).

The presence of other women is also noted in Argyre's Life. Christian women who were imprisoned at the same time as Argyre, also witnessed Argyre's tortures and her ascetic trials, as they testified when they were released from prison. When Argyre's fragrant preserved body was excavated three years after her martyrdom—another traditional Byzantine hagiographic theme—it was put to rest at the church of Saint Paraskeve, a woman martyr of an earlier era (NM, 115).

Another indicator that the martyr acts may have been women's literature aimed at a female audience is the disproportionately large numbers of Matrona's miraculous healings involving women, many of whom suffered from female illnesses and problems. The saint's ability to perform miracles in imitation of Jesus in the New Testament was also a common patristic and Byzantine theme<sup>24</sup> followed in Matrona's acts. Perhaps the most dramatic miracle was Matrona's resurrection of a barbarous foreigner who was participating in the invasion of Chios, and who had dropped dead when he was attempting to rape one of the nuns (NM, 146). Although the point of this resurrection story was that the powerful saint could heal and even bring unbelievers and evil people back to life, ultimately, as a result of Matrona's miracle, the whole island received better treatment by the foreigners when they returned to Chios at a later date. As in earlier periods, miraculous healings greatly impressed people as evidence of the special power of the Christian God. During the Turkokratia Muslim children were often baptized because Christian baptism was considered efficacious in warding off evil spirits.<sup>25</sup>

Another healing after Matrona's death that was also aimed at women and resulted in the spreading of her cult outside Chios according to the account, is one involving Maria, a Christian slave of a "Hagarene" from Magnesia, who convinced her ailing master to go to Chios and be healed by a Christian holy woman who healed all kinds of illness. The writer editorializes about Maria: "Truly brothers and sisters, it is just that we speak the words of the gospel also about this woman (Maria). 'Oh woman, great is your faith.' For

<sup>24</sup>Patlagean, p. 104.

<sup>25</sup>Vryonis, p. 135.

her faith toward God was truly great and unhesitating and her piety toward the holy woman (Matrona) did not hesitate and she was not afraid to say to herself, "Well, what if she does not heal the Hagarene . . . . What if she sees him and realizes he is not a believer . . ." (NM, 147). Matrona, however, does not disappoint Maria, saying to the Hagarene, "Through the tears and prayers of . . . your slave Maria, I heal you ." The cured master released Maria from her bodily slavery and she stayed on at Matrona's church for the remainder of her life. Meanwhile, "news of the miraculous cure became commonly known in Magnesia and many people went from that country to (Matrona's) shrine to worship her holy remains, as did people from many other places come . . . and it continues to this day" (NM, 148).

Another miraculous cure in 1705 involved the Vlach leader Sophronitz's wife, who suffered from gynecological ailments. (NM, 149); and another, occurred in 1734 when some men and their wives from the island of Siphnos stopped in Chios to pray for good winds for sailing. In the course of the liturgy one of the wives, who was mute, was healed by Matrona (NM, 150). Still another healing took place in 1734 when a dying woman from the town of Talaron was carried to Matrona's church by four men because her stomach was so swollen that her doctors said she would die (NM, 150). In 1760 a woman who had suffered for three days in childbirth and who was said to be dying by her midwives and doctors, was released from the danger, delivering a child (NM, 151). Still another incredible healing was of a woman from Constantinople who suffered from frightening dreams and fantasies. When she began to "suffer bodily anomalies from the fantasies," as the account reads, she went to Chios and spent Holy Saturday night at Matrona's church with many other women. She remained there laughing and crying uncontrollably until Ascension day when she had a demonic fit. After many trials and episodes she was cured through the grace of Matrona, when the demon left her body, not through her mouth as was traditional in much Byzantine hagiographic literature, but through her nipples (NM 152). Here, indeed, is a symbolic comment on the importance of female sexuality as a locus of power in the neomartyrs' time.

Still another healing that helped spread the cult of Matrona in Constantinople was of the daughter of an islander from Cos residing in Galata, who was healed from unclean spirits when she worshipped at Matrona's icon at the church of the Forerunner in Constantinople. Subsequently the whole family went to Matrona's church in Chios,

where the father was also cured through the intercession of the holy woman (NM, 153). The length and the type of detail, and the rhetoric are an indication again, not only of Matrona's importance as a local saint, but also of the spreading of her cult, especially to women, in a larger region outside Chios.

The liturgical parts of Matrona's *akolouthia* are also remarkable for their unusual feminine focus. They are clearly presented with a female audience in mind. Throughout the services the participants are exhorted to imitate Matrona's life, her passion, her contests and victorious battles against the demons. The vesper texts characterize her as the all-wise bride of Christ who bears God's wisdom. The readings that follow logically enough are from Old Testament Wisdom literature and include Wisdom 4.7-16, understood in the patristic period as a text eulogizing virginity;<sup>26</sup> Wisdom 3.1-9, focusing on the happiness, knowledge and love with which God rewards those he has tested and then accepted as a perfect burnt offering—an important sacrificial martyrdom motif also from the Patristic and Byzantine period as noted earlier;<sup>27</sup> and the third is the concluding chapter in Proverbs, a eulogy of the perfect, strong wife who will receive a reward from God in the future and who is rewarded in the present by having a good and appreciative husband and children. The reading can be understood as an allegorical description of personified wisdom,<sup>28</sup> but it makes perfectly good sense to the most literal minded of listeners as counsel on how to be a good Christian wife.

The orthros eulogizes Matrona and the Theotokos and links the two. Together they invite all those who have been strengthened by Matrona's battles to the bright banquet (NM, 141). Interestingly, references to the Theotokos are sparse also in the women neomartyrs' Lives. Aside from the liturgical references only the Life of Akylina mentions the Theotokos, and then only once. Matrona's acrostic canon read during this service praises her and addresses her as "divine mind and divinely wise," and "as being in the image and likeness of God (NM, 141)—traditional theological identifications. In another patristic and Byzantine commonplace, the Kathisma (NM, 142) presents Matrona as the all-wise example, who rises above her female nature

<sup>26</sup>*The New Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City, 1985), p. 1049, n. 4. The notes are a translation of those which appeared in *La Bible de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1973).

<sup>27</sup>Frances Young, *Sacrifice*, p. 228.

<sup>28</sup>*The Jerusalem Bible*, p. 1011, n. i.

and weak flesh. The verse before the recital of her Life concludes with a summing up of her victories over the forces evil and darkness . . . she has brought great honor to the female sex (NM, 143).

Matrona's liturgy also has a special female focus and message. In the reading from the Epistles, 2 Corinthians 6-11, Paul cites Eve's seduction by the snake, and warns that the listener given as a pure bride to a single husband—Christ—should not be led astray from single-minded devotion to Christ. The reading, however, is more than a warning and concludes with an apologia for Paul's wisdom (and the neomartyrs?). "Now I consider that I am not in the least inferior to the superlative (best) apostles. Even if there is something lacking in my public speaking, this is not the case with my knowledge, as we have openly shown to you at all times and before everyone." Here it seems is an attempt by Nikodemos to reinforce the idea that the neomartyrs are as important as, and equal to, earlier Church martyrs. And if viewed as strategic rhetoric, this makes good sense as counsel to uneducated women who are possibly lacking in public speaking, but are also not in the least inferior to the most important of Church apostles and witnesses. The Gospel reading that follows the Apostolos, Matthew 25.1-13, the parable of the ten virgins, is also pertinent to women. Matrona, as the long *akolouthia* indicated, and the other neomartyrs, also, are cast as Christ's wise virgins, as demonstrated above.

Another Byzantine theme in the Life of Matrona that rings true to its fifteenth century dating, are passages which suggest hesychasm. These fit well also with Matrona's presence through her miracles, in the eighteenth century, a time of hesychast revival on Mount Athos and they would appear to reflect Nikodemos' preoccupation with Palamas and the prayer of the heart. Four earlier passages in Matrona's Life relate her quest for hesychia. Of her return to the mountains the account says, "Matrona, was happy and liked it when her parents finally gave her permission to go and hesychasi (to be still or at peace). . ." (NM, 144). A few lines later in what is a good description of the goal of hesychastic mysticism and practice, attaining eternal beauty after undergoing purification through ascetic rigors, it is noted that she went again up the mountain to Katabasin, her first "hesychasterion," place of quietude, and that she stayed there for three whole years living in hesychia and in (spiritual) combat and that while she was bodily in Katabasis (descent), in soul, heart and mind she was to be found in the Anabasis (ascent), and in the

heights of heaven, imagining its ineffable beauty and being . . . rising by the placement of the heart." The apparent play on the words katabasin and anabasin also has another interesting theological aspect in that the word katabasin was used to describe Christ's bodily incarnation and anabasin, his ascension. Here Nikodemos may be pointing to the centrality of the Incarnation for those who choose to witness to the faith using hesychastic practices. Meyendorff maintains that the main point of Gregory Palamas' hesychastic thought is the Incarnation and that Palamas illustrates the spiritual ascent by depicting the Virgin Mary in the temple practicing 'holy hesychia'—'she fixed her spirit to turning in on itself, and attention and holy uninterrupted prayer.'<sup>29</sup>

The life of neomartyr Kyranna of Thessalonike—home of Palamas—also uses language and depicts behavior that could be considered hesychastic when during her imprisonment she showed a preference for hesychia and was rewarded by a divine vision. "Once she has made her confessional statement on her willingness to die for Christ, she declared she had nothing more to say; and henceforth she refused to answer anything more. She lowered her head . . . and praying intellectually (noeros—hesychastic language), her heart filled with spiritual light and joy, she imagined she saw intellectually (NM, 134). Here by the use of hesychastic detachment she is able to fight the demonic demands of the Muslims that she become apostate. The intense concentration Kyranna is able to sustain in spite of the torture and other distraction is also a result of hesychastic behavior, "The holy woman had so much patience, hesychia and quiet that it seemed that someone else was suffering, and not she, and that all of her mind and her attention was to be found in the heavens" (NM, 134). Ultimately on her death the divine light, another hesychastic phenomenon, shines over Kyranna's body.

While many theological presuppositions undergird the neomartyr acts there is little theological reflection and knowledge on the part of the neomartyrs. The accounts, however, include several traditional theological comments. Akylina, for example, makes a kind of confessional statement often made by martyrs when she exclaims that she can not deny "her creator and fashioner, the Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered and died for us on the cross" (NM, 187). Chryse also does this when she rejects her family for urging her to deny "Christ,

<sup>29</sup>John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas* (London, 1964), p. 149.

her true God." She continues with another Byzantine commonplace, saying that henceforth she has "as her father my Lord Jesus Christ, as mother, my Lady Theotokos, and as brothers and sisters, the saints . . . (NM, 260). Other traditional monastic themes and ideas are shown in the Life of Argyre who fasted and performed other bodily humiliations during her seventeen years of imprisonment. She conceived of prison as a place of rest in which she resided for Christ, and as a royal palace which she did not wish to leave, even when she had an opportunity to do so (NM, 115).

### *The Comparisons*

How do the female martyrs of the *Neon Martyrologion* compare with earlier female martyrs? While there are similarities in their lives—trials, condemnations, tortures—there are differences.

Helping to expedite this comparison will be the use of a five point thematic schema elaborated by Kraemer to explain the Lives of early saints. The categories include: comment on travel, on the virtues of the heroine, emphasis on the heroine's persuasiveness, and teratological and erotic elements.<sup>30</sup>

In examining how the neomartyrs compare in the first category, travel, it is apparent that it is not an element in their lives. Nor is there evidence of their evangelizing and converting women or men, an important component in Metaphrastes' women saints—and often the purpose of the saints' travels.

A major difference is also found when one compares the virtue of Nikodemos' female martyrs with those in Metaphrastes'—the second category. It is true that the martyrs are all virtuous in the traditional sense of being good, pious, faithful. But if family status, wealth, and origin, are included in this category, and saints' Lives traditionally have done this in a fairly standard stereotyped way, the differences are conspicuous. The neomartyrs are village girls from poor or modest Christian families. Metaphrastes' women are royal, aristocratic, or wealthy women of pagan families of high status and position in the major cities of the Empire. Among these are Eugenia of Alexandria,<sup>31</sup> Anastasia of Rome,<sup>32</sup> Juliana of Nikomedia,<sup>33</sup> Barbara of

<sup>30</sup>Ross Shephard Kraemer, *Ecstasies and Ascetic*, presented as a Ph.D dissertation to Princeton University, (Ann Arbor, 1977).

<sup>31</sup>PG 116.609-52.

<sup>32</sup>PG 115.1294-1308.

<sup>33</sup>PG 114.1438-452.



Heliopolis,<sup>34</sup> Catherine of Alexandria,<sup>35</sup> and Euphemia of Chalcedon, Melanie of Rome,<sup>36</sup> Pelagia of Antioch,<sup>37</sup> Euphrosyne of Alexandria<sup>38</sup> and Theodora of Alexandria.<sup>39</sup>

As conspicuously absent in Nikodemos' neomartyr accounts as it is present in Metaphrastes' is the theme of the martyrs' persuasiveness—the third category. Except for Matrona, no notice is made by Nikodemos of the neomartyrs' knowledge, wisdom, or ability to argue, dispute, orate or even teach. Matrona is wise and powerful and she is a model of which the female sex can be proud, as her *akolouthia* elaborates. But her wisdom and power are a result of her ascetic rigors and hesychasm, not her education or erudition. These are never mentioned. The imprisoned neomartyrs do not carry on philosophic or theological arguments or read the Bible or other religious literature, nor do they sing hymns and psalms or try to convert anyone. Even Chryse, who is subjected to six months of conversion efforts by Muslim women, is not shown disputing or arguing with them (NM, 259). The hesychastic element, in fact, seems to favor withdrawal and detachment.

Almost all the female martyrs listed in Metaphrastes are educated and learned. Thekla, protomartyr among women, who was a model for subsequent women saints, was fond of oratory and enjoyed intellectual exchanges with men.<sup>40</sup> Another Metaphrastes' martyr especially noteworthy for her knowledge was Catherine of Alexandria, listed as "great martyr," whose cult was second only to that of the Theotokos in the East and West after the Crusades. Both were reputed to have surpassed all men of their time in knowledge and intelligence. Catherine spoke many languages, and was educated in rhetoric, philosophy, geometry and other subjects. In prison, she converted those who came into contact with her and debated successfully with the leading pagan philosophers. The emperor personally took charge of her case and was determined that Catherine should

<sup>34</sup>PG 116.301-14.

<sup>35</sup>PG 116.275-302.

<sup>36</sup>PG 115.565-78.

<sup>37</sup>PG 116.753-94.

<sup>38</sup>PG 116.907-20.

<sup>39</sup>PG 106.305-22.

<sup>40</sup>PG 115.666-90.

return to her original pagan religion or die.<sup>41</sup> Barbara, daughter of a pagan king was educated by a leading Christian teacher. And Irene, Chione, Agape, and the other women from Thessalonike, who were arrested and martyred for not handing over their collection of sacred writings, spent all their time—night and day, studying them. The wealthy noblewoman Melanie of Rome, who became an ascetic and monastic, also was learned, travelling and meeting many of the leading church figures of her time, and reading the Scriptures to the other nuns in the monasteries that she established. And there are many other similar examples of learned women in Metaphrastes.

Teratological elements, the fourth category, are present in both Nikodemos' and Metaphrastes' martyrs. Metaphrastes' ascetics, Mother Mary of Egypt, and Pelagia, contend against and defeat demonic forces in the desert, the monastery and city. But as in the case of Matrona, the combat is not elaborated in great detail. In the neomartyr Kyranna's Life, she resists the devil's attempts to corrupt her by his secret machinations in making a local Janissary, serving as *Soumpasa*, fall in love with her with satanic passion (NM, 133). And Chryse, also battles the satanic love (erota) of a Muslim (NM, 259).

The fifth category, erotic elements, is present in four of Nikodemos' accounts. It is specifically their female sex and sexual attraction that make the neomartyrs targets for marriage, conversion, or corruption by the Muslims. There is no erotic or sexual element in Matrona's Life. Metaphrastes' accounts contain a variety of sexual motifs. Melanie, who is married, totally rejects sexual activity for a life of continence and convinces her husband to become an ascetic. Pelagia of Antioch, a repentant harlot dresses in male clothing and joins a monastery, where she is falsely accused of impregnating a village maiden. Mother Mary of Egypt lived a life of pleasure and sexual licentiousness until her repentance in Jerusalem and her flight to the desert, where for many years she was unable to forget her past life. Metaphrastes' other martyrs, too, are beautiful and attractive and have many pagan suitors. But the martyrs reject them and choose a life of continence to the chagrin of their pagan fathers, who are violently opposed to their daughters' Christianity.

In spite of these differences in erotic or sexual themes, there is one point on which all the acts of Nikodemos, and many of Metaphrastes and other important non-Metaphrasteian saints, like

<sup>41</sup>PG 115.821-46.

Makrina,<sup>42</sup> agree. They are all brides of Christ.

### *Conclusions*

In the preceding sections of this paper the Lives of the women neomartyrs in Nikodemos the Hagiorites' *Neon Martyrologion* have been analyzed. The close reading revealed several major differences between Matrona and the other women martyrs. Matrona, who in many ways receives favored treatment by Nikodemos, is modelled on the fourth century monastic Anthony and other earlier women ascetics — her martyrdom is of the flesh and involves withdrawal from the world to combat the demons, thereby acquiring power to perform great healing miracles. Especially interesting are the hesychastic elements in the lives of Matrona and Kyranna, a Byzantine legacy from the fourteenth century seen again now in the eighteenth century and a major area of interest to Nikodemos. Conspicuous in the Lives of the neomartyrs and in the acts and akolouthies is the pervasive use of other women and situations and themes of interest to women. Noteworthy is the portrayal of Akylina's mother, who like Salamone, the heroic Maccabean mother of seven martyr sons, encourages her daughter to go to her martyrdom rather than deny her faith. Fear of Turkish authorities is also evident in the accounts of the families' reactions.

While no direct comment is made by Nikodemos about the desirability or undesirability of virginity and becoming an ascetic, the very traditional patristic and Byzantine conception of both the ascetic and the blood martyr as the bride of Christ is present in the *Neon Martyrologion*.

The thematic analysis has revealed some important differences in family, class, location, education, and attitudes to marriage between the female martyrs of the early Church and those of the *Neon Martyrologion*. The women neomartyrs are poor, uneducated young village women of Christian families living in an empire that is aggressively Islamic. Metaphrastes early church martyrs, on the other hand, are mostly wealthy, aristocratic, educated, and articulate big city women of pagan families, who reject marriage or, if married, abandon their husbands for a life of continence and asceticism or martyrdom through death. Many of these women travel the empire—

<sup>42</sup>Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of St. Makrina*, trans. and intr. by Virginia Callahan (Washington, D.C., 1978).

an empire that is increasingly Christianized, to encourage conversion of other women. Nikodemos's martyrs, however, live in villages in fear of local Ottoman authorities and the control they have over their lives and have no apparent thought of evangelizing and converting others to Christianity. The most they can do is encourage holding the line.

In this context then, eroticism, or sexuality, plays a greater part in the rhetoric of the neomartyrs' Lives than it does in those of Metaphrastes. The female neomartyrs' only possible course of defiance of the Muslims, who possess all the social, political, and judicial power, is to choose death rather than to marry a Muslim and deny their faith. And that is exactly the action the *Neon Martyrologion* intends to promote and support. The heroic, saintly ideal projected by Nikodemos is that of an otherwise powerless woman who will not "become a Muslim" and deny her Christian faith.

What is new in Nikodemos' women martyrs is a rhetoric focusing on issues and situations of particular interest to poor and simple village women, who, by their insistence on not marrying and converting to Islam, made a persuasive argument to Christian women to adhere to their Byzantine tradition following the empire's conquest by a non-Christian power. This is evident, indeed in the Lives of these special saints of the *Neon Martyrologion*, Akylina, Kyranna, Chryse, Argyre, and Matrona, in the liturgical services honoring Matrona, and in the recounting of healing miracles attributed to her.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

---

## Toward the Reestablishment of Full Communion: The Orthodox-Orthodox Oriental Dialogue

---

THOMAS FITZGERALD

CONTEMPORARY ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX THEOLOGIANS have long regarded to need to heal the schism between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches as a preeminent challenge. While the formal opportunities for dialogue between Eastern and Western Christians have often received more public attention, the continuing dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches is one which could indeed result in the reestablishment of full communion in the not too distant future.

This possibility is clearly manifest in the most recent Statements produced by the "Joint Commission For The Theological Dialogue Between The Orthodox Church And The Oriental Orthodox Churches." Following an inaugural meeting in Chambésy in 1985, the full Commission met June 20-24, 1989 at the Anba Bishoi Monastery in Wadi-El-Natroum, Egypt and produced its first Statement. The second and most recent Statement was produced at a meeting of the full Commission held at the center of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Chambésy, Geneva, Switzerland on September 23-28, 1990.<sup>1</sup>

The Joint Commission is composed of distinguished hierarchs and theologians who are the designated representatives of the twelve autocephalous and two autonomous Orthodox Churches, and the five Oriental Orthodox Churches. Many of these representatives have been

---

<sup>1</sup>The Anba Bishoi Statement can be found in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 34 (1989) 393-97. The Chambésy Statement follows in this number of the Review. See also *Episkepsis*, 355 (15 April 1986) 11-12.

engaged in discussions on this topic dating back to at least 1964. Metropolitan Damaskinos of Switzerland (Ecumenical Patriarchate) and Bishop Bishoy of Damietta (Coptic Orthodox Church) are the co-presidents of the Joint Commission.

### *Historical Background*

The division between these two families of churches dates from the fifth century. The Council of Chalcedon held in 451 affirmed that while Christ is one person there exists in him two natures. The divine and the human natures exist without confusion, without change, without division, and without separation. The statement of the council further affirmed that "the difference between the natures is in no way removed because of the union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature is preserved and both combine in one person and in one hypostasis."<sup>2</sup>

The Statement of Chalcedon must certainly be understood within the context of the Christological debates which reached back at least to the Council of Ephesus in 431 and the differing emphasis in Christology which characterized the Alexandrian and the Antiochene traditions. In the hope of reconciling the best of these traditions, the statement of the Council of Chalcedon adopted the 'two natures in one Person' terminology and thus also opposed the teachings both of the followers of Eutyches and the followers of Nestorius. The former were true monophysites who appear to have united the two natures in such a manner that the human was absorbed by the divine. The latter appear to have emphasized the distinctiveness of the divine and human realities to such a degree that there was no real contact between the two.

In the decades following Chalcedon in 451, the decision of the Council was rejected by the Church of Egypt, the Church of Armenia, and the Church in West Syria known popularly as the Jacobite. Following the lead of these Churches, the Church in Ethiopia and that of

---

<sup>2</sup>The full text can easily be found in John Leith, ed., *Creeds of the Churches* (Atlanta, 1973), pp. 35-36. For a comprehensive discussion of the period of the council, see R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey* (London, 1961); Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (Chicago, 1971), pp. 226-77. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, eds., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Wurzburg, 1951); J. Kamiris, *Tà dogmatikà kai συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθόδοξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, 1960) 1, pp. 231-34, 322.

Malankar, India subsequently also came to reject the decision of the Council. Today, these Churches formally recognize only three Ecumenical Councils. They reject the designation 'Monophysite,' since they also repudiate the heresy of Eutyches. They are usually referred to as the 'Pre-Chalcedonian' or 'Oriental Orthodox Churches.'

The Churches of Rome and Constantinople accepted the decision of the Council of Chalcedon and were joined by portions of the churches in Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Today, the Orthodox Churches which accept the decision of Chalcedon include the twelve autocephalous and two autonomous churches which are in communion with the Church of Constantinople.

The Councils held in Constantinople in 553 and 680-681 attempted to heal the schism. However, differences in Christological terminologies and perspectives were greatly complicated by that time by cultural, political, and linguistic factors. Furthermore, the rise of Islam contributed to the hardening of the schism by further alienating the two families of churches. While some limited contact between the churches did occur in the Middle Ages and later during the Ottoman period, there was no significant effort undertaken to heal the schism.

New opportunities for contact between the theologians of both families of churches accompanied their involvement in ecumenical gatherings from the early decades of this century. The meetings of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches frequently provided valuable opportunities for theologians of the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches to meet together and to discuss common concerns.

On the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon in 1951, Patriarch Athenagoras and the Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople formally called for the establishment of a process of dialogue which would lead to the healing of the schism. In this encyclical, the Patriarch made frequent reference to the historic observatio of Saint John of Damascus. He claimed that those who did not accept the terminology of Chalcedon were "nevertheless Orthodox in all things."<sup>3</sup>

At the Pan-Orthodox Conference in Rhodes in 1961, the Orthodox

---

<sup>3</sup>*Orthodoxia* 26 (1951) 484-89; Saint John of Damascus, the Fount of Knowledge, 2.53 (PG 94.741).



Church formally recognized that its relationship with the Oriental Orthodox Churches was one of the most urgent matters awaiting serious attention. Likewise, the heads of the Oriental Orthodox Churches proposed the establishment of a theological dialogue in 1965.<sup>4</sup> Following the Fourth Preconciliar Conference in 1968, the Orthodox established a Preliminary Commission for dialogue which met in 1971.<sup>5</sup> The Oriental Orthodox Churches agreed in 1972 to establish a similar Commission. Representatives from both Commissions began to meet in 1972 and 1978 to discuss future directions. These meetings laid the groundwork for the Joint Commission which, as we have noted already, was established and met for the first time on December 10-15, 1985 in Chanbéy.<sup>6</sup>

The decision of the Rhodes Conference led directly to a number of "unofficial" consultations of theologians from the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches. These were held in Aarhus in 1964, Bristol in 1967, Geneva in 1970, and Addis Ababa in 1971. Each of these consultations produced significant statements which affirmed a common teaching on Christology and provided a very valuable basis for the establishment of the Joint Commission.<sup>7</sup>

The Statement issued at Aarhus in 1964 provided a significant foundation for all subsequent discussions. A very valuable portion of the Statement says: "On the essence of Christological dogma, we found ourselves in full agreement. Through the different terminologies used by each side, we saw the same truth expressed. Since we agree in rejecting without reservation the teaching of Eutyches as well as Nestorios, the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon does not entail the acceptance of either heresy. Both sides found themselves fundamentally following the Christological teachings of the one undivided Church as expressed by Saint Cyril (of Alexan-

---

<sup>4</sup>*The Oriental Orthodox Churches, Addis Ababa Conference*, (Addis Aberha, 1965).

<sup>5</sup>*Episkepsis*, 38 (21 September 1971) 9-10.

<sup>6</sup>*Episkepsis*, 50 (14 March 1972) 4-6; Bernard Dupuy, "Ou en le dialogue entre l'Orthodoxie et les Eglises dites monophysites?", *Istina* 31 (1986) 362-63.

<sup>7</sup>*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 10 (1964-1965) 14-15; 13 (1967) 133-36; 16 (1971) 3-6, 211-13. The papers which were delivered have also been published in conjunction with the Agreed Statements. See also Paulos Gregorios, William Lazareth and Nikos Nissiotis, eds., *Does Chalcedon Divide or Unite? Towards Convergence in Orthodox Christology* (Geneva, 1981); Archbishop Tiran Nersoyian and Paul Fries, eds., *Christ in East and West* (Macon, GA, 1987).

dria).’’<sup>8</sup>

### *Common Affirmations*

The Statements of Anba Bishoi and Chambésy are relatively brief. Yet, this brevity does not conceal the fact that both texts represent a very precise and cogent affirmation of the common faith shared by both the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox. Since the Statements come from a Joint Commission formally established by the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, they deserve great attention. They contain a number of very significant points which are of immense importance and which can not be underestimated. The Statements reflect both the common doctrinal convictions expressed at the earlier consultations as well as the historical and theological study of the Council of Chalcedon and other events associated with it undertaken in recent years.

Firstly, the two Statements solemnly affirm that both families of Churches share the same faith. This conviction is expressed in the opening words of the Anba Bishoi statement which says: “We have inherited from our fathers in Christ the one apostolic faith and tradition, though as Churches we have been separated from each other for centuries. As two families of Orthodox Churches long out of communion with each other, we now pray and trust in God to restore that communion on the basis of the common Apostolic faith of the undivided Church of the first centuries which we confess in our common creed.”<sup>9</sup>

This affirmation is further strengthened in the Chambésy statement when the Commission restates that both families of Churches reject both the Eutychian heresy and the Nestorian heresy. In opposition to the former, both Churches affirm that the Logos “only-begotten of the Father before all ages and consubstantial with Him, was incarnate and was born of the virgin Mary, fully consubstantial with us, perfect man with soul, body and mind . . .”<sup>10</sup> In opposition to the Nestorian heresy, the Commission affirms that both families of Churches “agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that Christ is consubstantial both with His Father and with us, by nature God

---

<sup>8</sup>*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 10 (1964-1965) 14.

<sup>9</sup>The Anba Bishoi Statement, p. 394.

<sup>10</sup>The Chambésy Statement, p.

and by nature man; it is necessary to affirm also that the Logos, who is by nature God, became by nature man, by His incarnation in the fullness of time."<sup>11</sup> The Statements show that despite fifteen centuries of formal separation, both families of churches have preserved the same Orthodox faith.

It is significant that both Statements clearly affirm that both families of Churches reject both the Nestorian and the Eutychian heresies. In the centuries following Chalcedon, those who accepted the decision of the Council were frequently accused by their opponents of harboring Nestorian tendencies. Likewise, those who rejected Chalcedon were often accused by their opponents of harboring Eutychian tendencies. Indeed, they were frequently labeled as "Monophysites" despite the fact that they explicitly repudiated the position of Eutyches. These unfortunate perceptions were frequently at the basis of the anathemas which were exchanged in the period following Chalcedon.

Secondly, the statements affirm that both traditions share a common understanding of the hypostatic union of the divinity and humanity in the unique theandric person of Jesus Christ. The Anba Bishoi statement says that this is a real union "of the divine with the union, with all the properties and functions of the uncreated divine nature, including natural will and energy, inseparably and unconfusedly united with the created human nature with all its properties and functions including natural will and natural energy."<sup>12</sup> The Chambésy Statement says that "the Hypostasis of the logos became composite by uniting to His divine nature with its natural will and energy, which He has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created human nature which He assumed at the incarnation and made His own, with its natural will and energy."<sup>13</sup> Clearly, these Statements affirm that both families of churches reject not only the Monophysite heresy as expounded by Eutyches but also the Monothelite heresy which denied that Christ possessed both a divine will and a human will.

Thirdly, the Statements, while not dealing directly with the Council, recognize that some of the important terminology used at Chalcedon is shared by both traditions. The Anba Bishoi Statement

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>The Anba Bishoi Statement, p. 395.

<sup>13</sup>The Chambésy Statement, p.

says: "The four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union belong to our common tradition—without commingling (or confusion) (*asyngchytos*), without change (*atreptos*), without separation (*achoristos*) and without division (*adiairetos*)."<sup>14</sup> The Chambésy Statement is even more explicit in affirming that both families of churches "agree that the natures with their proper energies and wills are united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division and without separation and that they are distinguished in thought alone."<sup>15</sup> While no direct reference is made to the Statement of the Council of Chalcedon, it is quite noteworthy that the theologians felt comfortable in citing terms which are so central to the dogmatic affirmation of that Council.

Fifthly, the Statements recognize that the authentic faith of the Church can be expressed in different formulas which are not contradictory. The Anba Bishoi Statement says that those who speak of the two natures in Christ "do not thereby deny their inseparable, indivisible union" and those who speak of "one united divine-human nature in Christ do not thereby deny the continuing dynamic presence in Christ of the divine and the human without change, without confusion."<sup>16</sup> Likewise, the Chambésy Statement affirms that both families of churches can continue to use the Christological terminology with which they are accustomed. The Oriental Orthodox can use the traditional Cyrillian terminology of "one nature on the incarnate *logos*." And the Orthodox, who also use this terminology, can also continue to use the two nature terminology of the Council of Chalcedon. When properly understood, both formulas can bear witness to the authentic faith of the Church.<sup>17</sup>

The Statements of the Joint Commission appear to recognize that the same faith can be expressed in an appropriate manner through the use of different theological terms. Some would argue that the alienation which resulted in the wake of the Council of Chalcedon was based in good measure upon the inability of theologians at that time to recognize this crucial perspective. In an effort to affirm the authentic faith, both families of churches clung mightily to their own

---

<sup>14</sup>The Anba Bishoi Statement, p. 396.

<sup>15</sup>The Chambésy Statement, p. .

<sup>16</sup>The Anba Bishoi Statement, p. 396.

<sup>17</sup>The Chambésy Statement, p. .

theological formulations and rejected those of the other. Each side claimed to follow the christological teachings of Saint Cyril. However, the spirit of charity, mutual respect and an openness to legitimate theological diversity were in short supply. Sadly, the example of Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch who agreed to the historic reunion Formulary of 433 was neglected.<sup>18</sup>

Finally, the Statements deal with the issue of the Ecumenical Councils. Both families of churches accept the first three Ecumenical Councils. However, it should be remembered that the Councils of Chalcedon in 451, those held in Constantinople in 553 and 680, and Nicaea in 787 are formally recognized only by the Orthodox but not by the Oriental Orthodox.

It seems that the Commission has wisely sought to deal with the doctrinal affirmations expressed at these Councils rather than the more formal issue of the acceptance or rejection of these Councils. Both Statements affirm that the two families of churches are in full agreement in their understanding of the historic faith. This means that the Oriental Orthodox Churches recognize the faith of the Church as expressed in the Councils of 451, 553, 680, and 787 although they may not formally recognize these councils as being "ecumenical." Conversely, it also means that the Orthodox recognize that the Oriental Orthodox Churches profess the same historic faith although the latter does not formally recognize certain Councils. A clear distinction is being made between the faith expressed at a Council and the Council itself.

It should be remembered that the Councils do not "invent" the Faith of the Church. Rather, the Councils bear witness to the Faith of the Church. Generally in opposition to a particular distortion, the dogmatic affirmations of the Ecumenical Councils have sought to bear witness to the Faith at particular times in history and using particular theological terms. This perspective upon the nature of an Ecumenical Council and its doctrinal affirmations is quite an important one. It reminds us that the emphasis must be placed upon the faith expressed by the Councils and not necessarily upon the exact number of Councils or the specific representatives who participated in a particular Council. Indeed, even the terminology used at a particular

---

<sup>18</sup>John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Washington, 1969), pp. 24-25.

Council must be understood both historically and contextually.<sup>19</sup>

The reception of a particular Council by the Church does not depend upon the number of bishops who attend, or their geographical distribution, or the person who convened it. It does not even depend upon whether a Council was designated as "ecumenical" at the time of its convocation. Indeed, there have been such 'councils' which have been subsequently repudiated by the Church. Rather, the issue of reception is one which is rooted in the reality of authentic faith. The doctrinal affirmation of a Council is honored and received by the Church if it bears witness to the authentic faith of the Church.<sup>20</sup>

The Orthodox Councils of 553 and 680 were clearly valuable attempts to heal the schism which came about in the wake of the Council of Chalcedon in 451. As with Chalcedon, their principal concern was with the struggle to explicate the Church's Faith especially with regard to the Person of Christ. Although the Oriental Orthodox Churches have not formally accepted these Councils as their own, the faith of the Church expressed at these Councils is their as well! Both the Anba Bishoi Statement and the Geneva Statement affirm this fact. The Anba Bishoi Statement concludes with a rather sweeping affirmation that the mutual agreement is not limited to the realm of Christology. It "encompasses the whole faith of the one undivided Church of the early centuries."<sup>21</sup>

The Chambésy Statement does pay special attention to the Orthodox Council of 787 which dealt primarily with the veneration of icons and the Christological affirmations which are at the root of such veneration. The Statement affirms that both families of Churches are in full agreement with the faith expressed in the decision of that Council. The Statement declares that "the Oriental Orthodox agree that the theology and practice of the veneration of icons taught by that Council are in basic agreement with the teaching and practice of the Oriental Orthodox from ancient times, long before the convening of

---

<sup>19</sup>It is interesting to note that bishops from the Church of Armenia were present at the Councils of 551, 660, and 787 although that Church did not accept the Council of 451.

<sup>20</sup>See Kallistos Ware, "The Ecumenical Councils and the Conscience of the Church," *Kanon: Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirchen II* (Vienna, 1774), pp. 217-33; "The Exercise of Authority in the Orthodox Church," *Ἐκκλησία καὶ Θεολογία*, 3 (1982) 941-69.

<sup>21</sup>The Statement of Anba Bishoi, p. 396.

the Council, and that we have no disagreements in this regard."<sup>22</sup>

### *Future Direction*

The members of the Joint Commission affirm in their two historic Statements that there is no doctrinal issue dividing the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox. The Commissioners state that "we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the Apostolic Tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in differing ways. It is this common faith and continuous loyalty to the Apostolic Tradition that should be the basis for our unity and communion."<sup>23</sup> While this has been the conclusion of consultations reaching back to that of Aarhus in 1968, the fact that this is the conclusion of an official Joint Commission formally established by both families of churches gives it an authority which is beyond challenge.

While there is an agreement in the understanding of the historic faith, there are a number of issues which still must be resolved before full communion can be officially restored. Three issues appear to be the most important. These are: the question of anathemas which were exchanged in the past, the process of harmonizing episcopal jurisdictions in places where both families of churches have communities existing side by side, and the process through which full communion will be declared.

The first issue has already been addressed by the Chambésy Statement. It recommends that both families of churches take the practical step separately of lifting anathemas on Councils and fathers of the other tradition which have been anathematized in the past. The Statement also recommends that "the manner in which the anathemas are to be lifted should be decided by the Churches individually."<sup>24</sup>

Following the Council of Chalcedon, the christological positions of the two traditions become more rigid. As a result of this, the Oriental Orthodox placed anathemas upon those who accepted Chalcedon and specifically upon Leo of Rome. This was done because the Oriental Orthodox felt that the Chalcedonian Statement was a repudiation of

---

<sup>22</sup>The Statement of Chambésy, p. 5.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid. p. 6.

the position of Saint Cyril and that it tended toward Nestorianism. Likewise, the Orthodox placed anathemas upon Dioscoros of Alexandria, Philoxenos of Mabbugh and Severus of Antioch chiefly because they refused to accept the terminology of Chalcedon. Certainly, it now seems that these personalities and their teachings can be seen in a better light. Each was a proponent of a particular Christological perspective reflecting issues associated with either the acceptance or rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. Given the fact that both the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox recognize that both families of churches have maintained the Apostolic Faith, we can now also recognize that these teachers bore witness to the faith although they may have reflected different theological traditions and preferred different terminology in their explication of particular Christological issues.<sup>25</sup>

One would like to hope that both families of churches can rapidly find a means to lift these anathemas. It would seem necessary that the Holy Synods of the fourteen Autocephalous and Autonomous Orthodox Churches would each have to approve the lifting of the anathemas directed against Oriental Orthodox teachers. Perhaps the decision of each Church could be formally proclaimed at meeting of official representatives convened by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. And likewise, the Holy Synods of each of the five Oriental Orthodox Churches would have to lift the anathemas against Orthodox teachers. Perhaps the Coptic Patriarchate of Alexandria could be instrumental in convening a meeting of official representatives of the five Churches to formally proclaim the action. The lifting of anathemas would be done in the light of the affirmation of common faith expressed by the Joint Commission and as a direct response to its recommendation.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>The Geneva meeting in 1970 dealt especially with the topic of anathemas. See especially Metropolitan John Zizioulas, "Ecclesiastical Issues Inherent in the Relations Between Eastern Chalcedonians and Oriental Non-Chalcedonians," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 16 (1971) 144-62. With regard to Dioscoros, it appears that his deposition at the Council of Chalcedon resulted not primarily because of his doctrinal position but rather because of his actions at the pseudo-council of Ephesos in 449.

<sup>26</sup>The lifting of anathemas will also provide the basis for the changes in certain liturgical texts which reflected these anathemas. See also: John Meyendorff, "Chalcedonians and Non-Chalcedonians: The Last Steps to Unity," in *Orthodox Identity in India. Essays in honor of V. C. Samuel*, ed. M. K. Kuriakose, (Bangalore,



Both families of churches will need to study the manner in which the reconciliation will be manifested in the actual organization of the Church. In some places this will not present much difficulty. But, in others, especially in the so-called 'diaspora' there will be the need for pastoral sensitivity, creativity, charity and patience. Where there are presently, "parallel episcopal jurisdictions," a process will have to be devised which will establish one bishop in each city or region and which will unite bishops into a single regional synod. This process may take some time and, indeed, may have to follow the reestablishment of full communion. Yet, it should be made clear to all that the bishop must not be seen as the "symbol" of disunity but rather as the sign of unity.<sup>27</sup>

The process of manifesting unity must be done in such a way that recognizes the distinctive liturgical customs, linguistic preferences, iconographic tradition and the legitimate historical character of the various ecclesial traditions. Indeed, it would seem that this diversity would properly manifest itself in parish settings. Unity in the Apostolic Faith does not mean the destruction of legitimate diversity in liturgical practices, customs, art and languages. Ultimately, this process will affirm not only that the Church manifests the Apostolic Faith but also that the Church is truly catholic.

Furthermore, we should not fall into the trap of believing that all organizational issues must be formally settled prior to the solemn reestablishment of full communion. Certainly, the leaders of both families of churches need to make a clear and unambiguous commitment to the resolution of all organizational concerns. Yet, we need to be careful that the God given grace which moves us toward reconciliation is not held hostage and becomes the victim of human sin. Indeed, it could be argued that our present state of disunity prevents us from 'seeing' certain resolutions. These resolutions to organizational concerns may become more evident once unity is restored and the "scandal" of disunity is overcome.

How will the unity of the two families of churches be formally proclaimed and restored? This is a question which does not lend itself to a simple answer. It should be noted that we are not talking about the "return" of one group or the "submission" of another. Rather,

---

1988), pp. 105-17.

<sup>27</sup>Zizioulas, pp. 154-59.

we are talking about the "restoration of full communion" between two families of local Churches which share the same faith. Thus, some would argue that the present movement toward reconciliation is unprecedented. And, therefore, there is no clear historical precedent for its public resolution. On the other hand, some would take note of the historic "Reunion Formulary" of 433. With this "simple" Statement, Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria and Patriarch John of Antioch agreed to end the schism and to restore communion between the two local Churches.

In recent years, two scenarios have been proposed from time to time. One emphasizes a regional form of restoration of communion. This is a more "bilateral" approach. The other seems to emphasize a more interecclesial. This is more a "multilateral" approach. With regard to the former, some have suggested that the process of reconciliation could be begun when an Orthodox Church and an Oriental Orthodox Church in the same region simply declare the establishment of full communion. For example, there has been talk in recent years of some bilateral restoration of full communion taking place between the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and the Oriental Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch.

The other approach places the emphasis upon a "multilateral" restoration of full communion. Here, some have suggested that a Council would have to be convened formally to proclaim the reconciliation. This Council would bring together the official representatives of the Orthodox Churches and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. These representatives would solemnly affirm the end of the schism and the restoration of full communion between the local Churches. Following this Council, the delegates would then join together in the celebration of the Eucharist. This celebration would indeed be the solemn and public affirmation of unity.

### *Conclusions*

The Anba Bishoi Statement and the Chambésy Statement of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches have a significance which can not be underestimated. These Statements are the work of a Joint Commission composed of the official representatives of both the Orthodox Churches and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. This means that the conclusions affirmed by the members come from an official body which has a very high standing.

The two Statements affirm that the two families of churches share the same Orthodox faith in spite of over fifteen centuries of formal isolation. These Statements reflect the study of the 'schism' which has been taking place, both in an unofficial and in an official manner, for nearly thirty years. The two families of churches are now in a position where they can move toward the eradication of anathemas and the development of a plan to formally proclaim the restoration of full communion.

The consensus expressed in the two Statements expresses fundamental agreement in the understanding of the Apostolic Faith of the Church. Although both Statements recognize that different terms have been used by the two families of churches to express this faith, there is a firm and unequivocal affirmation that the same faith is being expressed. These Statements reflect the painstaking work of theologians from both families of churches reaching back at least to 1964.

Clearly, the dialogue between the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox theologians should demonstrate to all those involved in ecumenical discussions that agreement in doctrinal affirmation is of critical importance. The dialogue between the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox has not reflected an indifference to doctrine. On the contrary, there has been a clear desire on both sides to seek the truth of the faith and to proclaim it. Clearly, reconciliation is to be based on and expressive of a common understanding of the Apostolic Faith.

Now, there is need for the historic conclusions of the Joint Commission to be communicated better at all levels of the Churches. These Statements should be studied by bishops at their synod meetings, by clergy at their meetings, by the members of theological schools, and by parish communities. There is a need for the clergy and the laity to become aware of the conclusions of the Commission and to also lay the groundwork for the restoration of full communion.

The God-given opportunity for reconciliation should not be lost. We have become "accustomed" to this schism. And, there is a danger that our ignorance, our pride, and our complacency could prevent this process from moving forward to fruition. Education is certainly needed. But also, there is need for a certain "change of heart." Through our prayer and our study, we need to recognize the tragic consequences of Christian division. And, we need to recognize that division does damage to our witness to the world. Thus, we need to pray as the Lord prayed "that all may be one" and we need to live our lives in accordance with this prayer as He did (Jn 17.21).

---

## **Joint-Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches**

---

**Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate,  
Geneva, September 23-28, 1990**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The third meeting of the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches took place at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Chambésy, Geneva, from September 23rd to 28th, 1990.

The official representatives of the two families of the Orthodox Churches and their advisors met in an atmosphere of prayerful waiting on the Holy Spirit and warm, cordial, christian brotherly affection. We experienced the gracious and generous hospitality of His Holiness Patriarch Dimitrios I, through of His Eminence Metropolitan Damaskinos of Switzerland in the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. We were also received two grand receptions, one at the residence of Metropolitan Damaskinos and the other at the residence of His Excellency Mr. Kerkinos, the Ambassador of Greece to the United Nations, and Mrs. Kerkinos.

The 34 participants (see list of participants) came from Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, India, Lebanon, Poland, Switzerland, Syria, U. K., U. S. A., U. S. S. R. (Russian Church, Georgian Church and Armenian Church), and Yugoslavia. The six days of meetings were co-chaired by His Eminence Metropolitan Damaskinos of Switzerland and His Grace Metropolitan Bishoi of Damiette. His Eminence Metropolitan Damaskinos in his

inaugural address exhorted the participants to “*work in a spirit of humility, brotherly love and mutual recognition*” so that “*the Lord of the Faith and Head of His Church*” will guide us by the Holy Spirit on the speedier way towards unity and communion.

The meeting received two reports, one from its Theological Sub-Committee, which met at the Orthodox Centre, Chambésy (20-22, 1990), and the other from its Sub-Committee on Pastoral Relations, which met at the Anba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt (Jan. 31-Feb. 4, 1990). The following papers which had been presented to the Theological Sub-Committee were distributed to the participants:

1. *Dogmatic Formulations and Anathemas by Local and Ecumenical Synods within their Social Context*—Revd Prof. John S. Romanides, Church of Greece.

2. *Anathemas and Conciliar Decisions—Two issues to be settled for Restoration of Communion Among Oriental Orthodox and Eastern Orthodox Churches*—Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios, Metropolitan of Delhi, Orthodox Syrian Church of the East.

3. *Historical Factors and the Council of Chalcedon*—Fr. T. Malaty, Coptic Orthodox Church.

4. *Historical Factors and the Terminology of the Synod of Chalcedon (451)*—Prof. Dr. Vlassios Phidas, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria.

5. *Interpretation of Christological Dogmas Today*—Metropolitan George Khodr—Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch.

6. *Interpretation of Christological Dogmas Today*—Bishop Mesrob Krikorian, Armenia Apostolic Church of Etchmiadzin.

The six papers and the two Sub-Committee reports, along with the “*Summary of Conclusions*” of the Fourth Unofficial Conversations at Addis Sub-Committee, formed the basis of our intensive and friendly discussion on the issues and actions to be taken. A drafting committee composed of Metropolitan George Khodr, Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, Archbishop Kashishian, Archbishop Garima, Revd Prof. John Romanides, Metropolitan Matta mar Eustathius (Syria), Prof. Ivan Dimitrov (Bulgaria) with Prof. B. Phidas and Bishop Krikorian as co-secretaries, produced the draft for the Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations to Churches. Another drafting Committee composed of Prof. Papavassiliou (Cyprus), Bishop Christoforos

(Czechoslovakia), Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios and Liqaseltanat Habtemariam (Ethopia), with Fr. Dr. George Dragas as secretary, produced the draft for the Recommendations on Pastoral issues.

The following is the text of the unanimously approved Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations.

## SECOND AGREED STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHURCHES

The first Agreed Statement on Christology (Annex 1) adopted by the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, at our historic meeting at the Anba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt, from 20th to 24th June 1989 forms the basis of this Second Agreed Statement on the following affirmations of our common faith and understanding, and recommendations on steps to be taken for the communion of our two families of Churches in Jesus Christ our Lord, who prayed "that they all may be one."

1. Both families agree in condemning the Eutychian heresy. Both families confess that the Logos, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, only begotten of the Father before the ages and consubstantial with Him, was incarnate and was born from the Virgin Mary Theotokos; fully consubstantial with us, perfect man with soul, body and mind (νοῦς); he was crucified, died, was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day, ascended to the Heavenly Father, where He sits on the right hand of the Father as Lord of all Creation. At Pentecost, by the coming of the Holy Spirit He manifested the Church as His Body. We look forward to His coming again in the fulness of His glory, according to the Scriptures.

2. Both families condemn the Nestorian heresy and the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret of Cyrus. They agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that Christ is consubstantial both with His Father and with us, by nature God and by nature man; it is necessary to affirm also that the Logos, Who is by nature God, became by nature Man, by His Incarnation in the fullness of time.

3. Both families agree that the Hypostasis of the Logos became composite (σύνθετος) by uniting to His divine uncreated nature with its natural will and energy, which He has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created human nature, which He assumed at the Incarnation and made His own, with its natural will and energy.

4. Both families agree that the natures with their proper energies

and wills are united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division, and without separation, and that they are distinguished in thought alone (τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ).

5. Both families agree that He who wills and acts is always the one Hypostasis of the Logos incarnate.

6. Both families agree in rejecting interpretations of Councils which do not fully agree with the *Horos* of the Third Ecumenical Council and the letter (433) of Cyril of Alexandria to John of Antioch.

7. The Orthodox agree that the Oriental Orthodox will continue to maintain their traditional Cyrillian terminology of "one nature of the incarnate Logos" («μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη»), since they acknowledge the double consubstantiality of the Logos which Eutyches denied. The Orthodox also use this terminology. The Oriental Orthodox agree that the Orthodox are justified in their use of the two-natures formula, since they acknowledge that the distinction is "in thought alone" («τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ»). Cyril interpreted correctly this use in his letter to John of Antioch and his letters to Akakios of Melitene (PG 77.184-201), to Eulogios (PG 77.224-28), and to Succensus (PG 77.228-45).

8. Both families accept the first three Ecumenical Councils, which form our common heritage. In relation to the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox state that for them the above points 1-7 are the teachings also of the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, while the Oriental Orthodox consider this statement of the Orthodox as their interpretation. With this understanding, the Oriental Orthodox respond to it positively.

In relation to the teaching of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of the Orthodox Church, the Oriental Orthodox agree that the theology and practice of the veneration of icons taught by that Council are in basic agreement with the teaching and practice of the Oriental Orthodox from ancient times, long before the convening of the Council, and that we have no disagreements in this regard.

9. In the light of our Agreed Statement on Christology as well as of the above common affirmations, we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they may have used Christological terms in different ways. It is this common faith and continuous loyalty to the Apostolic Tradition that should be the basis of our unity and communion.

10. Both families agree that all the anathemas and condemnations of the past which now divide us should be lifted by the Churches in order that the last obstacle to the *full unity and communion* of our two families can be removed by the grace and power of God. Both families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations will be consummated on the basis that the Councils and Fathers previously anathematized or condemned are not heretical.

We therefore recommend to our Churches the following practical steps:

A. The Orthodox should lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Oriental Orthodox Councils and fathers whom they have anathematized or condemned in the past.

B. The Oriental Orthodox should at the same time lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Orthodox Councils and fathers, whom they have anathematized or condemned in the past.

C. The manner in which the anathemas are to be lifted should be decided by the Churches individually.

Trusting in the power of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, Unity, and Love, we submit this Agreed Statement and Recommendations to our venerable Churches for their consideration and action, praying that the same Spirit will lead us to that unity for which our Lord prayed and prays.

#### SIGNATURES

of the Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations to the Churches  
(Chambésy, 28 September 1990)

*Orthodox Members:* Metropolitan Damaskinos, Co-President (Ecumenical Patriarchate); Prof. Vlassios Phidas (Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria); Prof. Athanasios Arvanitis (Ecumenical Patriarchate); Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Peristerion (Ecumenical Patriarchate); Prof. Fr. George Dragas (Ecumenical Patriarchate); Metropolitan Petros of Aksum (Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria); Metropolitan George Khodr (Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch); Mr. Nikolai Zabolotski (Russian Patriarchate); Mr. Grigoriy Skobej (Russian Patriarchate); Prof. Stojan Gosevic (Serbian Patriarchate); Dr. Ivan Zhelev Dimitrov (Bulgarian Patriarchate); Metropolitan David of Sukhum (Georgian Patriarchate); Mr. Boris Gagua (Georgian Patriarchate); Horepiskopos Barnabas of Salamis (Church of Cyprus); Prof. Andreas Papavasiliou (Church of Greece); Metropolitan Meletios



of Nikopolis (Church of Greece); Prof. Fr. John Romanides (Church of Greece); Bishop Jeremiasz of Wroclaw (Polish Orthodox Church); Bishop Christoforos of Olomouc (Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia); Father Joseph Hauser (Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia); and Father Heikki Huttunen (Finnish Orthodox Church).

*Oriental Orthodox Members:* Metropolitan Bishoi, Co-President (Coptic Orthodox Church); Bishop Dr. Mesrob Krikorian, Co-Secretary (Armenian Church of Etchmiadzin); Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East); Doctor Joseph M. Faltas, Assistant Co-Secretary (Coptic Orthodox Church); Bishop Serapion (Coptic Orthodox Church); Father Tadros Y. Malaty (Coptic Orthodox Church); Metropolitan Eustathius Matta Rouhm (Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch); Archbishop Aram Keshishian (Catholicosate of Cilicia); Archbishop Mesrob Ashdjian (Catholicosate of Cilicia); Father George Kondortha (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East); Archbishop Abba Gerima of Eluvabur (Ethiopian Orthodox Church); Rev. Habte Mariam Warkineh (Ethiopian Orthodox Church).

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

*Lincolnensis*, first edited and published by Constantine Sathas in *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi*, vol. 7 (Paris, 1894), but has also examined the version in M. Crusius (1584), reprinted by I. Bekker (1849), and the critical edition by S. Lampros in *Ecthesis Chronica* and *Chronicon Athenarum* (1902). Though we do not know the name of the author or his exact sources, he clearly shows a deep interest in the Ottoman Empire, especially after the Fall of Constantinople, and details the reigns of Mehmet II, Bayezid II, and Salim I, plus the early history of the Great Church of Constantinople under the Ottoman sultans, and includes digressions on Italy (especially Venice), Hungary, and Persia. His Greek style is mildly archaic and his command of ancient Greek is not particularly impressive. His use of language and knowledge of the early Patriarchate suggest that he was probably associated with the Great Church in some official capacity.

Marios Philippides has done us a great service by making available a very useful source for the study of Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople for the period 1373-1513. It is a source that no reputable historian of this period can afford to neglect.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church: Its Faith, History, and Practice.* By Demetrios J. Constantelos. Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1990. Pp. xiv. + 220. Soft, \$14.95.

*Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* was originally published by The Seabury Press of New York in 1982 and drew materials that previously appeared in the author's *The Greek Orthodox Church* (New York, 1967); *Marriage, Sexuality, Celibacy: A Greek Orthodox Perspective* (Minneapolis, 1975); from articles in *The Orthodox Observer*, *The Way*, *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, *Concilium*, and the *Jurist*, and from public lectures and sermons delivered by the author. The original edition contained 178 pages, while the new, enlarged and revised edition contains 220 pages. The organization of the new edition is the same as the previous edition, with the addition of material on the Greek Orthodox in Great Britain and the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia. The Index of Biblical Quotations has been omitted from the 1990 edition and the Bibliography expanded.

The Prologue suggests that the author has used a multidisciplinary approach, whereby he deals with anthropological, historical, and sociological phenomena, liturgy, and ritual. The emphasis is on the Greek intellectual and cultural influence on Christianity, underlining the function of Hellenism as a *Propaideia* to Christianity and as an integral part of early Christianity. The book is not aimed at specialists, though the author hopes that specialists will use it, but is intended for the educated laity and undergraduate students in the liberal arts and in the seminaries. It is focused on those who call themselves Greek Orthodox throughout the world, though the fifteen million figure is undocumented, as is the popular claim that there are about 200 million Orthodox throughout the world.

The core of the book are the five chapters dealing with (1) "The Religious Quest as a Preparation for Christianity"; (2) "The Faith of Greek Orthodoxy"; (3) "The Historical Development of Greek Orthodoxy"; (4) "Some Aspects of the Church's Faith and Experience"; and (5) "The Greek Orthodox in the English-Speaking World." The range is very wide and the comments of the author on his subject are incisive and even provocative on occasion. Father Constantelos is absolutely insistent on the importance of Hellenism in understanding the Orthodox Church: "Thus, in addition to the religious phenomenon (the evolution of civilization as a whole) and the Hebraic religious heritage, the Greek Orthodox view Ancient Greek (or Hellenic) philosophy and religious beliefs as a preparation (*propaideia*) for Christianity. The heritage of Hellenism is received both directly, from the Greek sources, and indirectly, through Hellenistic Judaism" (p. 20). The peculiarly Orthodox teaching of *theosis* (deification) is stressed as an area where Greek religious mysticism is apparent: "*Theosis* became synonymous with salvation, and salvation was the presence of the human in God, while damnation was the absence of God from the life of the human. Saint Irenaios put it in the following manner: 'In His unfathomable love, God became what we are, that He might make us what He is' " (p. 31). No less stressed is the significance of the Bible for the Orthodox Church: "The strength of the Bible lies in the fact that its function is not to impart scientific information, but to reveal God to man and to set forth a progressive spiritual revelation of the divine creator, culminating in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, God's Son and man's brother" (p. 46). Man (humanity) was created in God's image (Gen 1.26-27) and in man's spiritual odyssey he is confronted by the redemption offered by Christ as the

Messiah.

Certainly, *Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* can open the way for those who wish to learn something about the Greek Orthodox Church, but it can also provide the starting point for much further exploration and study. For Orthodox Christians it can provide a compact, easily read and understood review of what they are, where they have been, and where they are going as a church and faith community.

John E. Rexine  
Colgate University

*Hymns on Paradise.* By St. Ephrem the Syrian. Introduction and Translation by Sebastian Brock. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990. Pp. 240. \$8.95, soft.

From a cycle of hymns on the town of Nisibis (modern Nusaybin in southeastern Turkey), we are informed that Saint Ephrem served as a deacon and catechetical teacher under a series of unusual bishops, the first of whom was Saint Jacob of Nisibis, one of the 318 Fathers who attended the Council of Nicea in 325. It was this bishop who appointed Ephrem to a teaching post. Nisibis was besieged by the Persians on three different occasions (338, 346, and 350) and after its occupation by the Persians, Saint Ephrem, who was then in his late fifties, fled to Edessa (the modern Urfa), where he spent his last decade in a more Hellenized environment. He most likely died in 373.

Saint Ephrem was a prolific writer who wrote numerous hymns, four hundred of which have come down to us and even more have been lost. He also wrote verse homilies and several prose works, including biblical commentaries and treatises against various heretical writers. His commentaries especially contain profound insights, and that on Genesis is the most important, since it provides useful background to *The Hymns on Paradise*. The translator has conveniently provided a translation of the section dealing with Genesis 2-3. The most accessible of Saint Ephrem's commentaries has been *Diatessaron (Harmony of the Four Gospels)*, until recently known only in an early Armenian translation, but with the discovery of the Syriac original in 1956 (at least in part), a subsequent French translation of the entire commentary became available in *Sources Chrétiennes*.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.